

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I am not ready to vote. I do not wish a vote until we may have an opportunity for agreement on a reservation which may aid ratification of the treaty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I do not like to have the Senator from Georgia take the position—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senators on the other side desire to debate this matter still further, as it is now half past 5 o'clock, if the Senator will yield to me I will make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate, as in legislative session, adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 26, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Father Almighty, inspire us with a profounder faith in Thee, that we may lay hold of life and its eternal values and prosecute the work Thou hast given us to do with new energy and zeal, thus fulfilling Thy purposes and satisfying our own consciences. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TRADE-MARKS AND COMMERCIAL NAMES.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9023) to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 10, 1910, and for other purposes, and to disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill which the Clerk will report, disagree to all the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Senate amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LAMPERT, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

LEGISLATION RELATING TO SOLDIERS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 470.

Resolved, That for the remainder of the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress all proposed legislation relating to those who served in the World War (other than those of the Regular Establishment), excepting, however, legislation based on and relating to disability incurred in the service, shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Speaker is hereby authorized to make reference of bills heretofore introduced in accordance with the terms of this resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to send to the Ways and Means Committee all bills heretofore introduced or that may hereafter be introduced relating to the soldiers who served in the World War, excepting legislation relating to disability.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POU. I should like to ascertain from the gentleman if we can have some arrangement as to time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think I shall make a brief statement and then move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. POU. Does the gentleman mean—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The purpose is—

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. After I have made a brief statement.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman going to move the previous question immediately on making his statement?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; I think I shall.

Mr. POU. That cuts off all opportunity for debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield to the gentleman for a question after I have made my statement. The purpose of this legislation—

Mr. POU. Does the gentleman, my colleague on this committee, mean to tell us that his purpose is to cut off debate on this resolution?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. After the brief statement that I wish to make.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman is going to do that, I will make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky to withhold that for a moment. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for just a moment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman will remember that when I appeared before the Committee on Rules the other day his statement to me about time was that there would be 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I said there could be 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman said there would be.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. POU. I would like to ask the gentleman why this departure from the usual policy of fairness that has characterized the gentleman's course heretofore. I see no reason why the gentleman should not yield us 20 minutes on this side. I want to suggest to my colleague on the committee that this course of procedure is unusual and in my opinion unworthy of the great Committee on Rules and the chairman of it, who is now addressing the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This is the first time that I have taken advantage of the right of the majority members of the Committee on Rules to move the previous question after a brief statement as to what the majority proposes to do.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Reber
Bell	Eagan	Kendall	Rhodes
Benson	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Riordan
Blackmon	Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Robinson, N. C.
Bland, Mo.	Ferris	Kettner	Rodenberg
Boles	Fields	Kreider	Rowan
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Rucker
Brumbaugh	Gallivan	Larsen	Schall
Caraway	Garland	Lufkin	Scully
Carew	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Sears
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Smith, Ill.
Classon	Gould	McPherson	Smith, N. Y.
Cooper	Graham, Pa.	Maher	Snyder
Costello	Griest	Mann, S. C.	Steagall
Crago	Hamill	Mead	Steele
Cramton	Harrison	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Crowther	Haugen	Moore, Ohio	Stephens, Ohio
Cullen	Hocoy	Neely	Stoll
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Nicholls, S. C.	Strong, Pa.
Curry, Calif.	Hudspeth	O'Connell	Sullivan
Dewalt	Hulings	O'Connor	Tague
Dominick	Johnston, N. Y.	Pell	Weaver
Donovan	Jones, Pa.	Porter	Welty
Dooling	Kahn	Purnell	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-nine Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the rule.

The Clerk read the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, when interrupted by the point of no quorum—

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; not until I make my statement. Mr. Speaker, since being interrupted by the point of no quorum, I have talked with my colleagues on the Committee on Rules and am led to believe that statements made in the committee properly led members of the minority to believe that there would be at least 20 minutes allowed for debate on each side on this resolution. If that is true, and I believe it is after refreshing my recollection, I shall yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] out of the hour that is under my control. [Applause.] I will ask him to use as much of that time now as he can, because I think there will be little discussion on this side after he has concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state, before I yield the floor temporarily, that the purpose of this resolution is to get all the bills now pending in all the committees before the Committee on Ways and Means so that action may be had by a committee that has jurisdiction of all bills on this subject and act as soon as possible.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I shall not yield for a question at this time. I want to make a consecutive statement about this matter. I know what gentlemen have in their minds. But it is more important to the soldiers of the late war that some committee shall have jurisdiction of all matters pertaining to the legislation desired by Members of Congress than that some committees in the House shall lose or retain some of the jurisdiction they now have over this legislation. [Applause.]

Bills have been introduced that have been referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, to the Committee on Ways and Means, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, to the Committee on Education, to the Committee on Military Affairs, and to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Each of these committees is jealous of its jurisdiction, but the country does not care a penny for their jealousy or their jurisdiction. [Applause.] It is all-important that all bills referring to these matters be referred to some committee now organized and ready for action, that can do something upon this very important question. It is for the purpose of enabling the House to get action through an instrumentality that has already been created that this resolution has been agreed to by gentlemen who have been urging this legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I shall yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want the gentleman to yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Some of us would like to know what the resolution means.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman ought to explain the resolution and give the House some information.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU].

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be notified at the end of seven minutes. Mr. Speaker, nobody ever loses anything by being fair. [Applause.] I felt perfectly sure that the gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules, would consent, after consideration, to give the minority at least 20 minutes of time for the discussion of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the desire of the minority, at least of the Committee on Rules, is to secure speedy action on the bills providing for supplemental or additional compensation to the soldiers and sailors who served in the Great War. [Applause.] If it is the purpose of the Republican steering committee in ordering the resolution offered, referring all such bills to the Committee on Ways and Means—if the purpose is to secure speedy action, we bid you Godspeed, but I have a very well grounded fear that the purpose of this resolution in referring all of these bills to the Ways and Means Committee is to put them to sleep during the remainder of this session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minority of the Committee on Rules, with some immaterial amendments, offered a resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], some weeks ago as a substitute for the resolution now being considered, and I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House resolution 323.

Resolved, That a select committee consisting of 21 Members of the House be appointed by the Speaker for and during the period of the present Congress; such select committee shall have jurisdiction of all the following proposed legislation, which shall be referred to such committee, viz: Subjects relating to the civil reestablishment of all honorably discharged officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the present World War, including all bills, resolutions, or communications relating to their vocational rehabilitation, to their educational facilities of any kind, to their employment, providing credits, or providing additional compensation of whatsoever kind or in whatever form, including the bonus, hospital, and sanatorium facilities, or homes, or allotting lands; also subjects relating to war-risk insurance and compensation for disabilities incurred in the service, including allotments, and any and all other subjects principally and directly relating to or affecting the status or interests of the officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines aforementioned. Said select committee shall have the right to report at any time.

That all standing committees having jurisdiction of bills and resolutions referred to the select committee aforesaid under this resolution be, and they are hereby, discharged from further consideration of such bills and resolutions.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, that resolution provides for the appointment of 21 Members of the House by the Speaker. There is precedent for this. The committee should have jurisdiction of all bills relating to the subject. It was the idea of the minority and, no doubt, the introducer of the resolution that the Speaker would take the members of the respective committees which have charge of these bills—the Committee on the Public Lands, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Education—and that the Speaker would create a committee from the membership of the several committees, appoint this special committee not burdened with work, not burdened with all manner of responsibility, that it should take charge of such bills and at an early date report to this House some measure whereby ex-service men may know it is the purpose to do more practical and substantial justice. They have a right to demand at least the same treatment as the Government clerk.

The only way to secure consideration of the substitute which in this brief time I have described is to vote down the previous question. If the previous question is voted down, there may be an opportunity for considering the substitute. If the previous question is voted up, there can be no consideration of the substitute which I have put in the Record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been told that the Ways and Means Committee already has some 50 or 60 bills of this sort upon which they have taken no action. Is there any hope that they will be any more expeditious with this than with those?

Mr. POU. Of course I can not answer that question. I entertain a very pronounced opinion, but I will say this: I believe the people of the country, and the ex-service men particularly, would instantly take it as the earnest purpose on the part of this House to do something if, as in the water-power case, a select committee were appointed by the Speaker, with no other bills to consider except those dealing with this great question—a committee that would immediately go to work to investigate all the bills which have been introduced and in all human probability make an early report to the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Under the terms of this resolution does the gentleman understand that it affects bills that have already been acted upon by committees and that are now on the calendar of the House?

Mr. POU. I think not. Bills upon the calendar are under the jurisdiction of the House. But this resolution provides that all bills heretofore introduced on the subjects enumerated shall be referred to this select committee of 21, and that the respective committees that have had charge of them heretofore shall be discharged from further consideration of them. But, as I have said, this would not change the status of bills already on the calendar.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is a bill to which I had particular reference, reported by the committee last week, providing for an increased allowance to the men taking vocational training.

Mr. POU. That bill would be referred to this committee, as I construe the resolution.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, it would not. The resolution under consideration specifically excludes all bills that deal with disability. They are not included.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. POU. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman's idea of the purpose of this resolution is correct—and I am sure he can not be wrong—then this resolution would shelve all such legislation until after the elections.

Mr. POUL. That is the fear of the minority of the Rules Committee.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POUL. My time is limited. I have only a minute or so, and I have agreed to yield all of the remaining time.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman ought not to make insinuations against this side of the House without foundation.

Mr. POUL. I yield for a question.

Mr. DYER. I would like to have the gentleman state on what he bases the fear that the Republicans are not in favor of helping the soldiers when, as a matter of fact, they have always been in favor of helping the soldiers and the Democratic Party has never been. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. POUL. The gentleman is proceeding to take up my time to express his own views. The Republicans are in power, they have a large majority in this House, and if they had intended to do anything at all they would have done it by now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DYER. The record of the Republicans speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. POUL. I will proceed just a minute. There is no need to speak of the debt of gratitude the Nation owes to the ex-service men. It is far greater than the Nation will ever be able to pay. Need I ask your pardon for speaking of the sacrifice of my own young son? I think not. I was very proud of him, and for a long time after his death I could not bear to speak of my sorrow, but I have thought a great deal about the lesson of his short life. It has made me a broader and, I hope, God being my helper, a better man. I think I have just reason to be proud. I have the tokens he won of duty well performed.

In one of his letters from France he wrote, "Papa, they call us all 'Yanks' over here, and I want to tell you I am proud of it." [Applause.]

Before he was 21 he paid the great price, but his work enrolled him with the immortals. They laid him away to rest in a casket draped with that flag. Yes; I have the flag, too, which I shall leave as a priceless heritage to posterity. Do you wonder I feel a thrill I never felt before when I look upon that flag? As a child my father taught me to love the flag, but my love for it, the reverence I feel for it now, no words can describe.

My boy did not die in vain. I reverently thank God I was permitted to be his father. The men who served in the great World War have buried sectionalism in America forever. [Applause.] If they had done that and nothing more, they would deserve all we will ever be able to do for them. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] to yield, which he generously refused to do, for I would like to know what this resolution means before we vote upon it. A great deal of talk went around here yesterday among members of the Committee on Rules about what the Speaker was going to refer to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and what he was going to refer to this committee. I simply wanted to get into the Record whatever the Speaker had agreed to do on that question. I would like to have the gentleman from Kansas answer the question, if he will.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman from Texas, I have not consulted the Speaker about the references that he would make. I am sure that the Speaker will read the resolution and he will carry out its purpose and intent.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman does not have the information that I want.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SWEET. I want to ask the gentleman in reference to the language in the resolution. I would say that I am in sympathy with the spirit of the resolution, but I am doubtful as to the wording of it. The resolution states:

Excepting, however, legislation based on and relating to disability incurred in the service, shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Speaker is hereby authorized to make reference of bills heretofore introduced in accordance with the terms of this resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SWEET. Do I understand that according to a proper construction of that resolution the Wason bill and the bills introduced by Mr. RAMSEYER and by Mr. TREADWAY and others, which are now being considered in our committee, would be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. RAYBURN. They would all go to this graveyard of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is chairman.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who is the chairman of this committee, has already introduced a bill and got it reported here that will tear the War Risk Bureau wide open and put half of it in one department of the Government and half of it in another.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The bill that I introduced was to refer to the Committee on Pensions all pensions relating—

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, no; the gentleman's bill reported to this House would take the compensation division of the war risk insurance act out of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and put it over here in this Pension Department.

Mr. FORDNEY. That has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. If a man wants to ask me about the ability of this Committee on Ways and Means, I would say that it is just as able as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; but would any member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce contend that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is capable of handling a bill involving the intricate technicalities of a tariff law?

Will any member of the Ways and Means Committee of this House or any Member of this House contend that the Ways and Means Committee, that knows nothing about this law except in a general way, is as capable of handling the amendments to the war-risk insurance act as the committee that gave it birth and that has brought it to such a high standard in this land? [Applause.] In the name of all the gods at once upon what meat does this committee feed that it has grown so great? [Applause.] Sound the name of FORDNEY and the name of ESCH; ESCH will start a spirit of this House or any place else of this land as soon as FORDNEY. Call the roll of the committees. What committee of this House since the war closed has done anything for the crippled and the maimed of the American Army? The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by passing the Sweet bill. If you take the amendments that are introduced now and before the Interstate Commerce Committee and send them to this Ways and Means Committee you are sending them to their death, and as sure as you do it the country will hold you responsible for it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POUL. I have only one more speech.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the squarest citizens in the whole United States as well as one of the most consistent friends of the ex-service men is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL], who opened the opposition to this measure. I hesitate very much to disagree with him because I know that he wants to accomplish the things that are best for the service men, and any disagreement I should have with him would be purely in the method we would want to adopt. He has been a constant supporter of all legislation advocated by the American Legion and by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and is and always will be a friend of the service men. No man who has made the wonderful sacrifice that he has made for his country could do otherwise than he has done. I think it is natural that some questions would be asked about this resolution, and I am going to tell some of its history.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for one question before he starts?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. I would like to know why those of the Regular Establishment are to be excepted from this resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is one question, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, I myself asked, because I know that a great many men of this country went into the Regular Army just as soon as war was declared, but I do not believe it would apply to those men who volunteered in the Regular Army for the war, and I do not believe it would except the members of the Regular Establishment if the Ways and Means Committee desires to include them in bonus legislation, but the phraseology would naturally bring up the question the gentleman asks. Personally, I believe the Regular Army should be included. Now, this legislation was fathered by Republicans and Democrats alike, and I do not think we ought to be trying to talk politics over a resolution of this kind. It was fathered by men who wanted to get some action on the matter. It was taken up with Mr. D'Olier and the executive committee of the American Legion and they said that they wanted to get some

kind of legislation, not trying to dictate to Congress at all, because Congress ought to decide for itself. They favored the getting of these bills and resolutions all in the hands of one committee in order that action might be secured. Now, most of us cared very little whether it came through legislation proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], because his resolution is the basis of the substitute that would have been offered by the gentleman from North Carolina if he had had a chance, or through this resolution. The idea was that it ought to come from the committee that has to raise the money—

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In view of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, as the gentleman well knows, have had 40 bills before it for all these months and have had hearings on them and has not reported, why should the gentleman want to put an additional burden on the same committee as by the method proposed, especially when every fact goes to show this committee is not friendly to this legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think that is a very fair question, and I would say to the gentleman that the only reason we want to adopt this method of procedure is because we know the condition of the Federal Treasury, and we feel that the legislation ought to be brought out by the committee which was going to provide for the raising of the money. As a matter of fact I would, if we had plenty of available funds, be willing to accept the proposition of the gentleman from North Carolina. I know that he has brought it in in the spirit of extreme fairness in order to get action, but I think it ought to go to the committee which has to raise the money.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman realize that this Ways and Means Committee is always penurious and that an appropriation committee is always liberal, and does not the gentleman think that the soldier would be better off if the matter were in the hands of an appropriation committee rather than in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman I do not care to discuss the membership of the Ways and Means Committee, either Republicans or Democrats. If this Ways and Means Committee does not operate, we probably can secure action through caucus of both his party and mine, which will make it operate without regard to politics. Now, the question was raised, particularly by the gentleman from Iowa, as to how the war-risk insurance measures would be affected. I have just talked with the Speaker of the House, who will construe the resolution if it passes, and he said evidently there is only one bill now before the House—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman two minutes additional.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. There is only one bill before the House affecting war-risk insurance which would go to the Ways and Means Committee.

That is a bill that would provide that all the insurance premiums of all the ex-service men would be paid by the Government, and it is the only bill affecting the war-risk insurance which under this resolution would be transferred.

Mr. SWEET. I call the gentleman's attention to the Wason bill, on which hearings are being held. That relates solely to insurance. Would that be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Not unless it is a bill providing that all insurance premiums be paid by the Government.

Mr. SWEET. If it is purely an administrative bill, will it remain with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The Speaker assures me, and he can correct me if I misquote him, that that is one he would not take away and refer to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SWEET. Under the terms of the resolution it is limited to "disability incurred in the service," which relates solely to compensation. I am in sympathy with the spirit of this resolution and doubtful only as to its wording. If I was sure that we could take up the Wason bill and continue the hearings and go on with it and report whatever the committee may see fit to this House I would have no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can assure the gentleman—and if I am wrong the Speaker will correct me—that the Wason bill will stay in the gentleman's committee, and desire to say that no one would desire to take any jurisdiction from the

committee of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET]. He has done so much for ex-service men that they will all trust their interests to him.

I am sure the American Legion and its executive committee are perfectly satisfied with this particular resolution. I am sure that they would be just as satisfied, if the matter had come up before, and they could have made their decision on the substitute of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. It is purely a matter of what procedure we adopt; what we want is action, and we will get it. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, if the Democratic administration had taken as much time and had been as slow in preparing for and prosecuting a successful war as the Republican Party has been slow in giving justice to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who won that great victory, the German Kaiser to-day would be the military master of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to pay a compliment to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] who has just taken his seat. It is well known to the country, according to the reports recently in the public press, that it was the well-defined policy of the Republican Party in this House not to bring in legislation for the benefit of the soldiers who fought in the World War at this session of Congress. It was the gentleman from South Dakota who said in the public press, as I read it, that he intended to call a caucus of the Republican Members of Congress, and went so far, as the paper stated, to circulate a petition, and he laid down the law to you to the effect that unless you took this action he would let the country know who was responsible for the delay; and it is at his request to-day that you are trying to camouflage this proposition and make it appear to the country that you are going to do something for the ex-service men. I sincerely hope that you will.

So far as I am concerned I have been ready for months; and the Republican side has had control of this Congress since last May—almost a year—and now all that you can do in behalf of the ex-service men is to come in here with a resolution saying that all of these bills shall be referred to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration, while the men wait and wait for action. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are on this side, so far as the minority members of the Rules Committee are concerned, glad to strike hands with the gentleman from South Dakota, and for any resolution which will get speedy action and speedy legislation for the ex-service men.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANTRILL. Let me finish my statement.

I hope the gentleman is correct when he says that the Ways and Means Committee will bring in a bill here, but I fear that he is mistaken. For one I do not expect them to do it. They have had nearly a year. You have now four months until your national convention. Do not put this thing off. I serve notice on you now that this side of the House will bring this question to your attention again. Bring in some kind of a bill between now and your national convention and pass it through this House for the benefit of the ex-service men.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANTRILL. Just for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. We both of us desire action. Would not the best way to get this legislation be to vote for the previous question on the resolution and for the resolution?

Mr. CANTRILL. I want to say to the gentleman that I hope the House will vote down the motion for the previous question and give us an opportunity to present on its merits to that side of the House a substitute which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has put into the Record. If you vote that down, I am perfectly frank to say to the gentleman from South Dakota that I will join with him to vote to put it in the hands of the Ways and Means Committee, but I believe that the substitute is the better plan, and one that will bring better results for the ex-service men of the country. Give us a chance to bring up this substitute and submit it to that side of the House on its merits, and let the Speaker of this House appoint a special committee, with nothing else to do except to consider these bills. Then you will get some action. Do not bury the bills in the Ways and Means Committee or in any other committee, as I fear will be the result. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ah, Mr. Speaker, what is this action here to-day? As I pointed out, it is because the Republican side of the House is afraid to take issue with the gentleman from South Dakota and the men on this side of the House who want some action on this

matter. It is a command from the Republican steering committee of this House to kill this legislation, just as the Republican steering committee has commanded the Judiciary Committee and the Committees on Public Lands, Public Buildings and Grounds, Education, and other committees of this House to bury legislation which the members of these great committees stood for. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just on the question of the substitute.

The substitute which the gentlemen desire to offer, and I hope they will not get the opportunity to do it, proposes the appointment of a committee by the Speaker consisting of 21 Members, and, as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], it would be expected that that committee would be made up of a number of the ranking men on four or five or six different committees. These committees now are active committees of the House. They are all busy. Yet the gentleman says if they had a special committee made up in that way, that that committee would have nothing to do but to consider these questions. That committee would be composed of Members of the House now working night and day on their own committee work, and they never could get a quorum of the special committee together. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the observations made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] were the observations that controlled in the determination of the majority of the Committee on Rules against the special committee, and I think they are very well taken.

This is a very simple proposition. Here is a demand for soldier relief that has gone to the Committee on Public Lands; here is another that has come to the Committee on Education—a bill introduced that I myself fathered before the Committee on Education to provide for vocational education of all service men who desire such benefit; here is another that has gone to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; here are others gone to the Committee on Ways and Means. And if the business of this House is expedition, the first sensible thing to do would be to concentrate on a single committee to avoid conflicting proposals from various committees.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Not now. Therefore the Committee on Rules decided without opposition that it should go to one committee.

Now, as to whether it was to go to this particular committee or a specially appointed committee, it was thought first that a specially appointed committee, as was presented to us, would be too busy on account of its personnel being made up of members of other committees engaged in other work to do this particular work; and, second, it was thought that the Committee on Ways and Means is the one committee of the House to determine the income in the way of revenue to provide for the outgo to take care of such legislation as will be reported; and therefore, as the chairman of the Committee on Education, I voted to relinquish our claim upon that particular legislation which I fathered and which came to our committee. I believe all other committees will be willing to do the same. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 16 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be adopted by unanimous vote and that the resolution which the rule makes in order will be passed with the same unanimity. Since the convening of the Sixty-sixth Congress last May I have been deeply interested in beneficial soldier legislation. Many others on both sides of this House have had a like interest. Indeed, the large majority of the membership of this House have been greatly interested. I gave considerable time and thought to the preparation of a bill, H. R. 5545, which proposes to organize the necessary credit facilities through which every honorably discharged soldier, sailor, and marine of the great World War may acquire a home. Many other Members of the House, I think about 75 in number, have introduced bills proposing various plans of recognition to the soldiers. Every man has no doubt proposed what he thought was best and wisest. These

various bills have been pending for some time before a number of different committees. Some of us have been a little impatient over the apparent delay in their consideration. A number of us on this side of the House have several times conferred together on this matter. We have gone before the leaders of this side of the House and urged action. We have discussed among ourselves and with the leaders as to what would be the best plan to pursue. As a result of our conferences, we concluded some time ago that all of these soldier-aid bills should be referred to a single committee. Two plans were proposed. One was that a special committee should be created to which all of these bills should be referred. The other was that all of these bills should be referred to the Ways and Means Committee. After a somewhat careful consideration of the subject it was the conclusion of those in conference that, all things considered, the best plan was to refer all these bills to the Ways and Means Committee.

This committee consists of 25 members. It represents 24 States of the Union. New York is the only State having more than one representative on this committee. It has two. The East, the West, the North, and the South are represented on this committee. The soldiers from every part of the Nation will be represented on this committee. It will likewise represent the public interests in every part of this country. It is a safe committee to consider and act upon this important legislation. I believe the interests of the soldiers and the interests of the country will be safe in its hands.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that if the Ways and Means Committee would attend to its legitimate functions it would have enough to do between now and the end of this session?

Mr. MORGAN. I think that the Committee on Ways and Means for the time being, for 20 or 30 days, should suspend action upon all other bills pending and that its members should concentrate their time and ability in perfecting wise legislation in behalf of the soldiers of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. For a question.

Mr. GARRETT. The last suggestion of the gentleman raises a very interesting inquiry in the minds of Members.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. GARRETT. Back of all this is it the purpose to keep this legislation in that committee in order to relieve it from other duties?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know what pressing legislation is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I have talked with the chairman and with a number of the members of this committee on this subject. None of them, so far as I know, have been asking that these soldier-aid bills be referred to this committee. Those to whom I have talked recognize the responsibility to be placed upon them. They have not sought this task. They have not been asking for this additional jurisdiction. Persons not members of the Ways and Means Committee first proposed this arrangement, and they have been the ones who have urged its adoption. But now for the future work. Whatever legislation is pending before this committee, except such as is of immediate, vital, and supreme importance, must give way to the soldier-aid legislation. The time has come when there must be no further unnecessary postponement. The committee must give reasonable time for hearings on the various bills. The soldiers, sailors, and marines, individually and through their organizations, must be heard. The public also must be heard. In my judgment the soldier-aid legislation is the most important matter now pending before Congress. The fact that these bills shall be referred to the Ways and Means Committee does not relieve the other Members of this House from responsibility. Every Member of this House should study this subject with the utmost care, diligence, and thoroughness. We should aid and assist the Ways and Means Committee in every way in our power. In this matter we should be guided by the best impulses of our hearts and by the light of patriotic devotion to our country and its free institutions, which have been preserved and perpetuated through heroic deeds of our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the great World War.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think there has been general agreement on both sides of the House for some time that it was

important that all of the questions involving large expenditures on behalf of ex-service men should be considered by a single committee, at least all questions other than those that grow out of or relate to disability or have to do with the administration of present laws.

Some time ago certain gentlemen, who have been very actively interested in these matters, suggested and urged that some decision be reached in the matter. A committee of the American Legion with whom I talked also urged that all of these matters be referred to one committee. My first personal inclination was for the appointment of a special committee by the Speaker. But in discussing that with gentlemen on both sides I found there was much opposition to that procedure. It was urged, among other things, that any legislation involving large expenditures should be considered by the committee that has to do with the raising of revenue; that proposals of legislation that might involve a bond issue or raise the question of taxation, that would necessitate the general question of the revenues, ought to go to the committee that has jurisdiction over those matters. [Applause.] All of the other committees were perfectly willing to surrender their jurisdiction, except that there was some little question on the part of one or two members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. That committee is yielding less of its jurisdiction over these matters than any of the other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over them, because that committee retains all of its jurisdiction except jurisdiction over matters that relate not to service and disability but questions that go to the demands or requests or suggestions of all of the ex-service men. Otherwise the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce retains its jurisdiction, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances the Committee on Ways and Means is the committee that logically should consider all of these great questions.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, if I have time.

Mr. WINGO. On the gentleman's theory that the committee which has to do with the raising of revenue, or possibly bond issues, should have jurisdiction, does the gentleman intend to follow up that policy and have bills requiring compulsory military training referred to that committee, because, according to the gentleman's own statement, such bills will involve an expenditure of a billion dollars and involve a bond issue?

Mr. MONDELL. That question is silly.

Mr. WINGO. It requires neither character nor courage for the gentleman to take advantage of his position on the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I presume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. WINGO. I know he has the floor and is abusing the privileges of the floor.

Mr. MONDELL. The matter that the gentleman refers to has no relation whatever to the matter treated in this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The first vote will be on the previous question. If the previous question is not ordered, the control of the House will be turned over to the Democratic side, and everybody knows how incompetent they are to manage the affairs of this country, as they have shown in the last eight years. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the members of the Ways and Means Committee are members of no other committees. Is it true that they always have a quorum at their meetings?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The members of that committee are members of no other committees, and I understand they have very little other work to do at this particular time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not a fact that the water-power bill, one of the most important bills before the House, has been delayed in its consideration for three or four months because the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], the chairman of that committee, is also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has had the railroad bill before it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And would not that illustrate the situation we would have if the Democratic proposal prevailed?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think the gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. POULSON demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 127, not voting 93, as follows:

YEAS—208.

Ackerman	French	McArthur	Rowe
Andrews, Nebr.	Fuller, Ill.	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Bacharach	Gandy	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Baer	Garner	McKinley	Sanford
Barbour	Glynn	McLane	Scott
Begg	Goodall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sells
Benham	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shreve
Black	Graham, Ill.	McPherson	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Green, Iowa	MacCrate	Sinclair
Bowers	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Sinnot
Britten	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Sisson
Brooks, Ill.	Hadley	Magoe	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Hamilton	Mann, Ill.	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Hardy	Mansfield	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Harrell	Mapes	Snell
Buchanan	Hawley	Martin	Steenerson
Burdick	Hays	Mason	Stiness
Burke	Hernandez	Merritt	Strong, Kans.
Burroughs	Hersey	Michener	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Hickey	Miller	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hicks	Monahan, Wis.	Swope
Campbell, Pa.	Hill	Mondell	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hoch	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Chandler	Hulings	Morgan	Thomas
Christopherson	Hull, Iowa	Morin	Thompson
Coady	Husted	Mott	Tilson
Cole	Hutchinson	Mudd	Timberlake
Copley	Ireland	Murphy	Tincher
Dale	James	Nelson, Wis.	Tinkham
Dallinger	Jeffers	Newton, Minn.	Towner
Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Mo.	Trailway
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Wash.	Nichols, Mich.	Vaile
Dempsey	Juhl	Nolan	Vare
Demmon	Kahn	Ogden	Vestal
Dickinson, Iowa	Kearns	Olney	Volstead
Dowell	Keller	Osborne	Walsh
Dunbar	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	Walters
Dunn	Kiess	Parker	Ward
Dyer	King	Peters	Wason
Echols	Kinkaid	Platt	Watson
Edmonds	Klecza	Radcliffe	Webster
Elliott	Knutson	Ramsey	Wheeler
Elston	Kraus	Ramseyer	White, Kans.
Esch	Lampert	Randall, Wis.	White, Me.
Evans, Nebr.	Layton	Reavis	Williams
Fairfield	Lazaro	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ill.
Fess	Lea, Calif.	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, Pa.
Focht	Lehlbach	Rhodes	Winslow
Fordney	Little	Ricketts	Wood, Ind.
Foster	Longworth	Riddick	Yates
Frear	Luce	Robison, Ky.	Young, N. Dak.
Freeman	Luhling	Rogers	Zihlman

NAYS—127.

Almon	Doughton	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.
Ashbrook	Drane	Lanham	Rayburn
Aswell	Dupré	Lankford	Robinson, N. C.
Ayres	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Romjue
Bakka	Evans, Mont.	Leshner	Rouse
Bankhead	Evans, Nev.	Linthicum	Ruby
Barkley	Fisher	Loneragan	Sabath
Bee	Flood	McAndrews	Sanders, La.
Bland, Va.	Gallagher	McClintic	Saunders, Va.
Blanton	Ganly	McGlennon	Sherwood
Box	Gard	McKeown	Sims
Brand	Garrett	McKiniry	Small
Briggs	Goodwin, Ark.	Major	Smithwick
Brinson	Griffin	Mays	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Stevenson
Byrns, Tenn.	Harrison	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Tex.
Caldwell	Hastings	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Candler	Hayden	Mooney	Taylor, Colo.
Cantrill	Heflin	Moore, Va.	Tillman
Carss	Hersman	Nelson, Mo.	Upshaw
Carter	Hoey	Oldfield	Venable
Casey	Holland	Oliver	Vinson
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Padgett	Watkins
Cleary	Huddleston	Park	Welling
Collier	Hull, Tenn.	Parrish	Whaley
Connally	Humphreys	Phelan	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Igoe	Pou	Wingo
Davey	Jacoway	Quin	Wise
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, Ala.	Woods, Va.
Dent	Johnson, Miss.	Rainey, H. T.	Wright
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, J. W.	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Kincheloe	Raker	

NOT VOTING—93.

Anderson	Costello	Fields	Jones, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Crago	Fuller, Mass.	Kelly, Pa.
Anthony	Cramton	Gallivan	Kendall
Bell	Crowther	Garland	Kennedy, Iowa
Benson	Cullen	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.
Blackmon	Currie, Mich.	Goldfogle	Kettner
Bland, Mo.	Curry, Calif.	Good	Kreider
Boies	Dewalt	Gould	Langley
Booher	Dominick	Graham, Pa.	Larsen
Brumbaugh	Donovan	Griest	Lufkin
Caraway	Dooling	Hamill	McCulloch
Carew	Eagan	Haugen	McDuffie
Clark, Fla.	Ellsworth	Houghton	Maher
Classon	Emerson	Hudspeth	Mann, S. C.
Cooper	Ferris	Johnston, N. Y.	Moon

Moore, Ohio	Reber	Smith, Ill.	Sullivan
Neely	Riordan	Smith, N. Y.	Tague
Nicholls, S. C.	Rosenberg	Snyder	Voigt
O'Connell	Rose	Steagall	Weaver
O'Connor	Rowan	Steele	Welty
Overstreet	Rucker	Stephens, Miss.	Woodyard
Pell	Schall	Stephens, Ohio	
Porter	Scully	Stoll	
Purnell	Sears	Strong, Pa.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. HUDSPETH.
 Mr. PURNELL with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. LARSEN.
 Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. BENSON.
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WEAVER.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. OVERSTREET.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. PELL.
 Mr. REBER with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
 Mr. COOPER with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. BOIES with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. O'CONNOR.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. VOIGT with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. DOMINICK.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. CRAGO with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. EAGAN.
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. McDUFFIE.
 Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. RIORDAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 326, nays 4, answered "present" 2, not voting 96, as follows:

YEAS—326.

Ackerman	Brooks, Pa.	Copley	Evans, Nev.
Almon	Browne	Crisp	Fairfield
Anderson	Browning	Dale	Fess
Andrews, Nebr.	Brumbaugh	Dallinger	Fisher
Anthony	Buchanan	Darrow	Flood
Ashbrook	Burdick	Davey	Focht
Aswell	Burke	Davis, Minn.	Fordney
Ayres	Burroughs	Davis, Tenn.	Foster
Babka	Butler	Dempsey	Fraser
Bacharach	Byrnes, S. C.	Denison	Freeman
Baer	Byrns, Tenn.	Dickinson, Mo.	French
Bankhead	Caldwell	Dickinson, Iowa	Fuller, Ill.
Barbour	Campbell, Kans.	Doremus	Gallagher
Barkley	Campbell, Pa.	Doughton	Gandy
Bee	Candler	Dowell	Ganly
Begg	Cannon	Drane	Gard
Benham	Cantrill	Dunbar	Garner
Black	Carss	Dunn	Glynn
Bland, Ind.	Carter	Dupré	Goodall
Bland, Va.	Casey	Dyer	Goodwin, Ark.
Blanton	Chidblom	Eagle	Goodykoontz
Bowers	Christopherson	Echols	Graham, Ill.
Box	Clark, Mo.	Edmonds	Greene, Mass.
Brand	Cleary	Elliott	Greene, Vt.
Briggs	Coady	Elston	Hadley
Brinson	Cole	Esch	Hamilton
Britten	Collier	Evans, Mont.	Hardy, Colo.
Brooks, Ill.	Counally	Evans, Nebr.	Hardy, Tex.

Harrell	Lonergan	Osborne	Strong, Kans.
Harrison	Longworth	Overstreet	Summers, Wash.
Hastings	Luce	Padgett	Summers, Tex.
Hawley	Luhling	Paige	Sweet
Hayden	McAndrews	Parker	Swope
Hays	McArthur	Parrish	Taylor, Ark.
Healin	McClintic	Peters	Taylor, Colo.
Hernandez	McFadden	Phelan	Taylor, Tenn.
Hersey	McGlennon	Platt	Temple
Hicks	McKenzie	Pou	Thomas
Hill	McKeown	Quin	Thompson
Hoch	McKiniry	Radeliffe	Tillman
Hoey	McKinley	Rainey, Ala.	Tilson
Holland	McLane	Rainey, J. W.	Timberlake
Howard	McLaughlin, Mich.	Raker	Tincher
Huddleston	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Ramsey	Tinkham
Hullings	McPherson	Ramseyer	Towner
Hull, Iowa	MacCrate	Randall, Calif.	Treadway
Hull, Tenn.	MacGregor	Randall, Wis.	Upshaw
Humphreys	Madden	Reavis	Vaile
Husted	Magee	Reed, N. Y.	Vare
Hutchinson	Major	Reed, W. Va.	Venable
Igoe	Mann, Ill.	Rhodes	Vestal
Ireland	Mansfield	Ricketts	Vinson
Jacoway	Mapes	Riddick	Volstead
James	Martin	Robinson, N. C.	Walsh
Jeffers	Mason	Robison, Ky.	Walters
Johnson, Ky.	Mays	Rogers	Ward
Johnson, S. Dak.	Mead	Romjue	Wason
Johnson, Wash.	Merritt	Rouse	Watkins
Jones, Pa.	Michener	Rowe	Watson
Jones, Tex.	Miller	Rubey	Webster
Jaul	Minahan, N. J.	Sabath	Welling
Kahn	Monahan, Wis.	Sanders, Ind.	Whaley
Kearns	Mondell	Sanders, La.	Wheeler
Kelley, Mich.	Montague	Sanders, N. Y.	White, Kans.
Kless	Mooney	Sanford	White, Me.
Kincheloe	Moore, Ind.	Scott	Williams
King	Morgan	Sells	Wilson, Ill.
Kinkaid	Morin	Sherwood	Wilson, La.
Kitchin	Mott	Shreve	Wilson, Pa.
Klecka	Mudd	Siegel	Wingo
Kraus	Murphy	Stas	Winslow
Lampert	Nelson, Mo.	Sinnott	Wise
Lanham	Nelson, Wis.	Sisson	Wood, Ind.
Lankford	Newton, Minn.	Slemp	Woods, Va.
Layton	Newton, Mo.	Small	Woodyard
Lazaro	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, Idaho	Wright
Lee, Calif.	Nolan	Smith, Mich.	Yates
Lee, Ga.	O'Connor	Smithwick	Young, N. Dak.
Leibach	Ogden	Snell	Young, Tex.
Leshner	Oldfield	Stedman	Zihman
Lithicum	Oliver	Steenerson	
Little	Olney	Stiness	

NAYS—4.

Garrett Johnson, Miss. Rayburn Stevenson

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Green, Iowa Knutson

NOT VOTING—96.

Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Kendall	Riordan
Bell	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Rosenberg
Benson	Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Rose
Blackmon	Ferris	Kettner	Rowan
Bland, Mo.	Fisher	Kreider	Rucker
Boies	Fuller, Mass.	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Booher	Gallivan	Larsen	Schall
Caraway	Garland	Lufkin	Scully
Carew	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Sears
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	McDuffie	Sinclair
Classon	Good	Maier	Smith, Ill.
Cooper	Gould	Mann, S. C.	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Graham, Pa.	Moore	Snyder
Crage	Griest	Moore, Ohio	Steagall
Cramton	Griffin	Moore, Va.	Steele
Crowther	Hamill	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Cullen	Haugen	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Ohio
Currie, Mich.	Hersman	O'Connell	Stoll
Curry, Calif.	Hickey	Park	Strong, Pa.
Dent	Houghton	Pell	Sullivan
Dewalt	Hudspeth	Porter	Tague
Dominick	Johnston, N. Y.	Purnell	Voigt
Donovan	Keller	Rainey, H. T.	Weaver
	Kelly, Pa.	Reber	Welty

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. WELTY.
 Mr. HICKEY with Mr. STOLL.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. LARSEN.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
 Mr. KELLER with Mr. McDUFFIE.
 Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BELL, voted?

The SPEAKER. He has not.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia. I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OFFICIAL DELEGATION FROM THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a good many Members of the House at one time or another have visited the Hawaiian Islands practically as guests of the legislature or the people there. There is an official delegation now in Washington for a very brief period from the Hawaiian Islands, and I beg to ask that all those Members of the House who have made any of these visits will meet with us in the Republican cloakroom—Democrats being cordially invited—for the purpose of seeing whether we will take any action toward social or other entertainment for this delegation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. When do you want them to meet?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Right away.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan calls up a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"There is hereby authorized for the expenses of said commission, including the employment of expert services and all incidental and contingent expenses, a sum not to exceed \$5,000, payable one-half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL E. MAPES,

B. K. FOCHT,

BEN JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,

WILLIAM M. CALDER,

MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House of Representatives at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to H. R. 6863, entitled "A bill to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On Senate amendment No. 1: Authorized the appropriation of \$5,000 for the expenses of the zoning commission. The conferees agreed to the amendment with an amendment authorizing an appropriation of not to exceed the sum of \$5,000.

On Senate amendment No. 2: Provided that the zoning commission might make different regulations for the various zoning districts in the District of Columbia, and the conferees agreed to that amendment.

On Senate amendment No. 3: Provided that in the residence districts the usual accessories of a residence located on the same lot, including the office of a physician, dentist, or other person, and including a private garage containing space for not more than four automobiles shall not be prohibited, and the conferees accepted that amendment.

CARL E. MAPES,

B. K. FOCHT,

BEN JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added three amendments to the bill as it passed the House, two of them being more in the nature of regulations than anything else. One amendment provided that in making the different zones in the District different regulations might be made for the different zones. Another provided that no regulations made by the zoning commission should prevent the usual appurtenances going with a house and lot, such as a garage, and so forth. The third amendment appropriated \$5,000 to meet the expenses of the commission, for expert services, clerical work, and so forth. The House conferees accepted the first two amendments that I have mentioned, and the amendment making the appropriation was changed so as to authorize not to exceed \$5,000 of appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

RETURN OF THE RAILROADS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have received telegrams this morning from 52 business men living in the State of Michigan expressing the hope that the President would sign the railroad bill, and asking Congress to see to it that the railroads are immediately returned to their owners. I ask unanimous consent to insert these telegrams in the RECORD.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the resolution respecting the bonus to soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the national memorial, for which a million dollars has been raised, to men who lost their lives in the late war, the memorial to be erected on ground given by Congress to the association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the resolution passed this afternoon with respect to granting a bonus to soldiers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair. The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Quartermaster General: Chief clerk, \$2,750; principal clerks—5 at \$2,250 each; 3 at \$2,000 each; clerks—15 of class 4, 29 of class 3, 50 of class 2, 93 of class 1, 39 at \$1,000 each, 10 at \$900 each; draftsmen—3 at \$1,800 each, 7 at \$1,600 each; 5 at \$1,400 each; hydraulic and sanitary engineer, \$2,000; civil engineer, \$1,800; electrical engineer, \$2,000; electrical and mechanical engineer, \$2,250; marine engineer, \$3,500; sanitary and heating engineer, \$1,800; 6 messengers; 14 assistant messengers; 12 laborers; laborer, \$600; in all, \$383,590: *Provided*, That immediately following the approval of this act the purchase service and the storage service in the Office of the Quartermaster General, Director of Purchase and Storage, shall be consolidated, together with their personnel, equipment, books, papers, and records, and thereafter these two services shall be administered by the Quartermaster General as the "Supplies Division."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso beginning with the word "*Provided*," in line 4, page 77, and ending with the word "division," in line 11 of the same page. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and does not come within the Holman rule, because it does not carry on its face evidence that it is a saving or a reduction of appropriation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, under the Holman rule it is in the province of the Chair to look to the law as it now stands to determine whether or not the provision proposed comes within the rule, with reference to the reduction of expenditures or a reduction in the number of officers or in their salaries. The law as it now stands provides for the office of Quartermaster General 59 clerks, at \$1,000 each. The law as it is proposed provides for 39 clerks, at \$1,000 each. The proviso against which the point of order is made is a part

of this entire clause. I think it is a fair presumption that the reduction that is made, and which is patent upon its face, is due to the provision which requires the consolidation of these departments. It was for the purpose of reducing or making it possible to reduce not only the 20 employees that are reduced by reason of this provision, but to enable this department for the fiscal year 1921 to reduce at least 30 per cent of the employees now engaged therein. It will result by reason of this consolidation in the removal of those officers who are now engaged in duplicating work. It will result not only in that, but will eliminate innumerable delays and inefficiency. Very full hearings were had upon this subject, and not only is it the opinion of the Quartermaster General that this reduction may be made if this consolidation is had, but it is likewise the opinion of the Inspector General and the opinion of the experts who are in a position to know the possibility of that reduction; and they all agree with the report of the Bureau of Efficiency that it would result in a saving of many millions of dollars to the Government of the United States. For the very purpose of bringing this within the rule we, in this proviso, made it manifest that it will result in a reduction. We have reduced the number of statutory employees, and I think it is fair to say to the committee, in order that they may know what prompted us in doing this, that by reason of this proposed consolidation we were able to reduce, and it had much to do with our reduction in the general lump-sum appropriation of \$2,500,000. Under the estimate for the Quartermaster Corps submitted by the War Department, upon which the appropriation of \$2,500,000 is based, there were a great many officers who were provided for in the Quartermaster Corps and in these other corps that were omitted by your committee. That perhaps is de hors the record; but within the record it is perfectly patent that there has been a reduction made in the statutory employees of 20 men at \$1,000 each, a net saving to the Government of \$20,000 a year. It is by virtue of this consolidation that the reduction is made possible.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question but that this proviso is subject to a point of order as being new legislation. I do not question the motives of the gentlemen who are members of the Committee on Appropriations, and I heartily approve their action in trying to reduce expenses; but, as a matter of fact, the number of commissioned officers in the Military Establishment is fixed by law.

There are so many in each grade and it is immaterial, so far as the expense is concerned, to the Government whether they are detailed in the Quartermaster's Department or in some other department of the Government, and this legislation would not, in my judgment, reduce the number of commissioned officers in the United States Military Establishment. They do have the right, however, to curtail the expenditure so far as the number of clerks are concerned, and in that I heartily concur, but it does not follow that in curtailing the number of clerks that they should have the right to usurp the functions of one of the standing committees of this House that has been given jurisdiction over this character of legislation. I might say further that the Committee on Military Affairs, having given this matter careful consideration, in its judgment will bring in a bill in a few days accomplishing the very purpose which the gentleman from Indiana intends to accomplish in this roundabout way. In the interest of orderly procedure, if nothing more, this legislation ought not to be attached to an appropriation bill and I hope the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the Chair will recall yesterday in making a ruling as to the application of the Holman Rule that the Chair said, in connection with his decision of a point of order upon this question, that the Chair was not permitted to guess; that it must be plain from the section that it was germane and that it result in a saving. Now, the gentleman seeks to bring it within that ruling by saying that it is plain by referring to the law that gives so many clerks to this place and so many to the other, but he has made no reference whatever to the military side of this question, and I dare say, notwithstanding the wonderful hearings he has had upon this subject, he could not really tell this House how many men there were in these branches of the service, whether or not the consolidation was increasing or decreasing the number of men who are to perform the service. Now, in functioning from a military point of view certain rules of procedure are followed that are not followed in civil life. In functioning it is very probable that in putting these branches of the service together, while you may use a less number of clerks for the civilian work, that you would increase the work for the Army itself, and in that way increase the cost instead of reducing it. And because of that situation, and because it makes it necessary for the Chair to guess upon this subject, the point of order must be sustained

and not rob the Committee on Military Affairs of the duty of legislating for the military affairs of this country, and particularly just on the eve of the bringing in of a bill which has been ordered reported from the Committee on Military Affairs and which will be in this week. I therefore insist upon the point of order and I ask for a ruling.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to one statement made by the gentleman from New York, I want to call the attention of the committee thereto. He said that this proposed limitation would not decrease the expense of the Quartermaster Department, because if we take out the civilian clerks, which, he admits, would decrease the expense by consolidating these two branches, he said officers of the Military Establishment would have to be detailed to do this work, at an increased expense. The Chair well knows that the pay of officers of the Military Establishment is not affected whether they are doing arduous and laborious work or whether they are sitting idle. The expense is the same, and they can be detailed to Washington or elsewhere. The purpose of this committee is not to deal with the officers of this Military Establishment or their detail, other than to bring the two departments together under one head and increase efficiency and decrease the expenditures of the civil personnel of these two branches, and it seems to me clearly that the committee is within its right, under the rules of this House, in proposing this reduction of expenses, so far as the civilian clerks in these two branches are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. This is, of course, legislation. It may be good legislation and it might possibly save expenses, but the Chair sees nothing in this proviso that indicates on its face that the necessary result will be to retrench expenditures or reduce the number and salary of officers of the United States. To qualify under the Holman rule, this item would have clearly to show upon its face that is the necessary result. The mere fact that in another part of the bill some officers or employees have been dropped out does not change this item in any respect.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. May I make this suggestion: It is a well-known rule of construction that an entire paragraph must be construed together, just the same as an entire law. This proviso, with the paragraph, is a reduction—

The CHAIRMAN. But that does not change the question at all. The rest of the paragraph is in order. This proviso is new legislation, and can only be held in order under the Holman rule, and the Chair does not think that it comes under the Holman rule, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making an inquiry. When this proviso is stricken out, do we then have enough money provided to care for both of these departments?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If this proviso is stricken out, the War Department, in their reorganization, will have to make their cloth fit the person. They will have to cut it accordingly.

Mr. SISSON. In other words, in order that this matter may be taken care of, it will be necessary that the Committee on Military Affairs shall adopt this language?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. SISSON. Or something like it; if not, we will have to make an appropriation for the purpose to take care of both of these services?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no question—

Mr. CALDWELL. There is no question but what it will be taken care of, but we want it done in a scientific way.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And the other committee will do exactly what we are trying to do here.

Mr. CALDWELL. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Surgeon General: Chief clerk, \$2,250; principal assistant librarian, \$2,250; principal clerk, \$2,000; chemist, \$2,100; assistant chemist, \$1,600; pathologist, \$1,800; microscopist, \$1,800; assistant librarian, \$1,800; anatomist, \$1,600; entomologist, \$1,600; photographer, \$1,500; 2 translators, at \$1,800 each; clerks—14 of class 4, 13 of class 3, 26 of class 2, 36 of class 1, 13 at \$1,000 each, 2 at \$900 each; engineer, \$1,400; skilled mechanic, \$1,000; 2 messengers; 11 assistant messengers; 3 firemen; 3 watchmen; superintendent of building (Army Medical Museum and Library), \$200; 6 laborers; 4 chormen; in all, \$185,740.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I note from this paragraph there are employed 105 clerks in this department. The paragraph just preceding has something over 250. May I inquire of the chairman how this compares with the number of employees in this department prior to the beginning of the war?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This is just exactly what they had before the war. These are the statutory positions they had at that time. Each one of these departments had additional employees which they obtained under lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. DOWELL. In this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; in this bill for previous years; and I understand they are employing some of these clerks out of an appropriation they received from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, may I inquire if the list in this paragraph is all of the employees that were in the department prior to the war?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Approximately so, I understand, except occasionally when there were some special appropriations made or some arrangement was made for specific purposes out of some contingent fund. But in the main this represents the number of employees before we entered the war.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire if it is the purpose of the committee to bring these departments back practically to a pre-war basis?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; and for the purpose of doing it the provisions in this bill, if carried out with reference to the expenditure of money, and if the Committee on Military Affairs conforms to the ideas of the Appropriations Committee as expressed in this bill concerning the necessities of this department, it will reduce the number of employees in the War Department from the present total of about 21,000 for the fiscal year 1920 to 3,500 for the fiscal year 1921—a considerable reduction, is it not?

Mr. DOWELL. Quite a reduction; but upon reading this paragraph and seeing the number of employees I was wondering if the committee had really started toward a prewar basis.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We are making as strong an endeavor in that direction as we know how to make. If we could get the cooperation of everybody along this line, we would get back.

Mr. DOWELL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, and such other services as the Secretary of War may deem necessary, may be employed only in the office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors, fortifications, and surveys and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor estimates and bills, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1921 shall not exceed \$50,400; the Secretary of War shall each year, in the annual estimates, report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman if they usually carry this legislation in the legislative bill or in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It has been carried in this bill for a great many years.

Mr. GARRETT. The legislative bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, War Department: For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange; books of reference, blank books, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps; typewriters and adding machines; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges, fuel, gas, and heating apparatus for and repairs to buildings (outside of the State, War, and Navy Department Building) occupied by the War Department and its bureaus; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks and motor cycles, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; street car fares, not exceeding \$750; and other absolutely necessary expenses, including a per diem allowance not to exceed \$4 in lieu of subsistence, \$250,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 80, line 15, I move to strike out the sum of \$250,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLANTON: Page 80, line 15, strike out "\$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee and the chairman to the fact that in this paragraph, to be paid for out of this \$250,000, are the following items: Periodicals, newspapers, oilcloth, sponges, and street car fares not exceeding \$750. Over on another previous page we find also to be paid for, cushions, wardrobe cabinets, leather for covering sofas; and on another page we find chamois skin, pitchers, lace, powders, tumblers, flower garden; and again the item of street car tickets not exceeding \$250, making \$1,000 for street car tickets alone. I want to ask the chairman and the committee if we are going to continue appropriating for all of these items of luxury, the great majority of which could be done without by these ease-loving department employees, and

are we to keep on paying for these needless luxuries just because the departments place them in their estimates? Now, I take it that the young ladies who are employees in these departments, and the dandy officers, do not need these wardrobes, lace, and leather sofas, and they do not need these powders and chamois skins.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They may or may not need the powder.

Mr. BLANTON. They ought to furnish their own powder, and their own chamois skin and their own lace, and I take it that these officers down there in the War Department ought to work during business hours and they would not have time for all these luxuries. They have no need and there is no necessity for these leather-covered sofas down there. We have done away with leather-covered sofas in the House Office Building. Why, I am informed that you will not find a leather-covered sofa in the whole House Office Building now. We are getting along without them. Why can not the War Department do without them? Do the well-kept officers, after their two hours' noon-day lunch, which usually takes about three hours to devour, have to take a buttermilk siesta for another hour on these leather-covered sofas? I want to say that we ought to wake up on this proposition of real economy, and we ought to cut out all of these unnecessary luxuries in these departments.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does not the gentleman believe that if a man ate a three-hour meal he ought to have a sofa to lie down on for a while?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say this, that I have rung up and have had my secretary to ring up department chief after department chief down there, from time to time, along about from 5 minutes to 12 o'clock until along about 5 minutes to 3 o'clock, and it has been almost impossible to get hold of anybody down there except some second or third secretary or some underling. I want to say that I can not come to any other conclusion but that after these long two or three hour meals at noontime, when we are told the chief is out at lunch, these leather-covered sofas are put into use down there for an afternoon buttermilk siesta.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does the gentleman from Texas think when he waits three hours he ought to stand up during all that time or have a sofa upon which he can recline while he is waiting?

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a matter of levity with me; it is not a matter of facetiousness. This is a matter of strict business. I am here to represent 325,000 people who live in my district, who expect me to help the committees on appropriations cut out these useless and extravagant appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has a misapprehension in reference to the kind of powder that is provided for here. It is not face powder for the ladies that he is talking about; it is bug powder, and the only question in the mind of the committee was as to whether or not we have appropriated enough for bug powder. We thought they ought to have more of it and get more bugs out of the department and out of these offices.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will reduce these appropriations and will cut out some of these useless luxuries for the offices out of this bill, we will probably get rid of some bughouse officers in some of the departments and save the people some of these expenses. If this is bug and not face powder, it ought to be so denominated in the bill, which merely says "powder." As chamois skin is used with face powder and not with bug powder, I expect this money will buy face powder.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment. I merely wanted to show the chairman where we are drifting.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia for the use of the War Department, \$23,700.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to return for a moment to page 75, for the purpose of making a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to page 75 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, what is the technical amendment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. On page 75, in the item with reference to the Red Cross reimbursing the War Department for auditing the accounts of the Red Cross, the words "American National" should be inserted before the words "Red Cross." I ask unanimous consent to amend by adding, in line 3, after the word "the," the words "American National," and also adding, in line 4, after the word "the," the words "American National."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to return to page 75 for the purpose of offering the amendment indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wood of Indiana: Page 75, line 3, after the word "the," insert the words "American National," and, in line 4 of the same page, before the word "the," insert the words "American National."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee about the item in line 22 of page 80, "For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia by the War Department, \$23,700"? Does that include all of the buildings that the War Department occupies outside of the war building?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it does not. Twenty-two thousand five hundred dollars of that sum is for the payment of the rent on a long-term lease. There are many other buildings that are rented in the District of Columbia by the War Department, or quite a few other buildings, that are paid for out of the Army appropriation bill. We have provided in this bill, in order to retrench expenditures of that character, that steps shall be taken for the purpose of ascertaining the unoccupied space that may be used for the housing of the war activities. We discovered just a few days before we entered upon the consideration of this bill that they have two floors in the building which they rent for storage purposes on G Street, for which we are paying \$10,000 a year, whereas all the material that they have stored there could be stored in one of the buildings in Potomac Park.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire if it is possible, if the proposed reduction of clerks be made, that there will be room in the war building for a number of these offices and if additional space can not be had by reason of the dismissal of a number of the thousands of unnecessary clerks there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have no doubt that that can be done.

Mr. DOWELL. Has this committee control over the rental of buildings, or appropriations for the rental of buildings, outside of the regular war building?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It has nothing to do with the rental of buildings. All it does when the proper showing is made is to provide the money to pay for the rental. I will say to the gentleman that we have sought in various ways to call to the attention of the allotment space committee the waste space that is now in many of the Government-owned buildings, where the activities now conducted in rented buildings might well be taken care of.

Mr. DOWELL. Has this committee any way of restricting these departments in leasing buildings outside and paying any rental they may see fit to pay?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They can not lease any building without authority, except under the war-time act—the Overman Act—under which they could rent almost anything they wanted to; but that will cease when the proclamation of peace comes, if it ever comes.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, may I inquire of the chairman if there is a possibility or probability that a restriction will be made as to the rental of these buildings outside of the regular war building?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They can not rent any building now outside of the established law except by specified authority, and, so far as the committee is concerned, we have nothing to do with granting that specific authority. But if we had, I assure the gentleman that we would restrict it all we could.

Mr. DOWELL. Let me inquire further: A large number of buildings were erected last year for the purpose of housing

different departments of the Government. May I inquire if all those buildings are now being occupied by the various departments?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are all being occupied in some manner. But there is not any question in the world that if the proper authorities become active many of these departments could materially reduce their space. I am of opinion that the Director of Finance in the War Department, who has five wings in the Potomac Park building on the third floor, could confine all the activities of that department now easily within two wings. But they are attempting to occupy everything they have.

Mr. DOWELL. That is what I wanted to inquire about. Is it possible now, with the influence of this committee, to reduce the space in the buildings outside of the buildings owned by the Government?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. This committee has nothing to do with the space proposition. That is the function of a commission on the allotment of space, a commission appointed by the House and the Senate, and it is the business of that commission to look after and to provide space for these activities and to utilize the unoccupied space in the Government buildings to house bureaus and divisions now in rented buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. DALLINGER. I understood the gentleman from Indiana to say that most of this item of \$23,700 was for a long-time lease of a private building. May I ask where the building is located?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is at Eighteenth and E streets.

Mr. DALLINGER. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that very considerable portions of the temporary buildings constructed by the Government for office purposes during the war have been vacated from time to time, and I believe that every single Government activity could to-day be housed in buildings owned by the Government. I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he knows what the total rental of private buildings in the District of Columbia is at the present time; I mean the total rental per annum paid by the Government for the use of private buildings to house Government activities.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is absolutely no way for this committee to tell what the total rentals are, because of the fact that that does not come within the purview of our jurisdiction.

The Book of Estimates for the last year would tell what it was at that time, and perhaps the gentleman could get the information he desires from that quarter.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman if in his opinion it would not be possible for the Government to house all of these employees in the buildings that it owns, and then assign these leases? Of course, if the Government has a long-time lease, it must pay the annual rental which under the contract it is obligated to pay, unless there is a provision for cancellation in the lease; but is there any objection that the gentleman can see to selling those leases to private parties and having the money realized therefrom go into the Treasury, and then house these Government activities in Government buildings?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I can see no objection at all to it, and I think it would be a good business proposition to do it. I am perfectly frank to say that if the Committee on Appropriations had had jurisdiction over the allotment of space, there would have been a great many removals and consolidations here within the last few weeks. It was discovered to this committee that there is space in almost every one of these temporary buildings erected for war-time emergency. Especially is this true of the Potomac Park buildings, where that immense space is still being occupied in some way by the same bureaus that were occupying it with full forces during the peak of the war, and they do not make any effort to reduce that condition. We have a commission on allotment of space, and if we could just succeed in getting this commission to carry out the purposes for which it was created, I have no doubt it would result in a great saving.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that the Committee on Appropriations, by reducing the appropriations for various departments here which are still keeping up their war-time activities, will make still further space for other departments?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We put a provision in this bill requiring that when they come back before this committee next year they will have to make a showing to this committee with reference to the rented buildings occupied not only by the War Department but by other activities; that they are occupying these rented buildings because they can not get space in the Government-owned buildings. We put in that provision for the

purpose of doing all that we could to stop the use of these rented buildings and to utilize all possible space in the Government-owned buildings.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is discussing the Potomac Park buildings and other temporary buildings, which are referred to two or three pages further along in the bill. Perhaps that is the more appropriate place at which to make some observations about those buildings; but if we are to continue the discussion here, I should like the opportunity to say something on the subject.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish the gentleman would wait until we get to that point in the bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. That was my idea, to wait until that part of the bill is read, although we seem to have drifted into this discussion here.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will do that.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BEE. I have heard a good deal of discussion about a reduction of the forces in the War Department, and, of course, they ought to be reduced. But is it not true that growing out of the war there are a great many wartime activities which make it impossible to effect a reduction now to the prewar basis until they get rid of the multitude of correspondence that every Member of Congress has every day and that every Member of Congress refers to the War Department, which the War Department must investigate and refer back to Members?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no question about that. I will say to the gentleman that at the time we entered the war, and when it became necessary to provide some new housing for the War Department, the Army building and the Navy building on Potomac Park were built as practically permanent buildings—I suppose as permanent as any that we have—on the theory that after we got out of the war it would take at least 10 years to get back to normal conditions, and that during all that time a greater number of clerks and heads of bureaus would be required for the purpose of winding up these activities than were required at the time we entered the war.

Mr. GARD. Did the gentleman say a greater number each year?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; a greater number than we had before the war. That is always one of the aftermaths of war. We have never had a war yet that has not left the Government with an increased number of clerical employees.

Mr. BEE. Necessarily so under the circumstances, in order that the resulting correspondence may be properly carried on.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I believe even after we get back to a peace basis the net result is always an addition to the pay roll of the civil service of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Park police: Lieutenant, \$1,900; first sergeant, \$1,700; sergeant, \$1,580; 54 privates, at \$1,360 each; in all, \$78,620.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there has been any change of law authorizing this paragraph?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; there has been. The fact of the business is that these seeming increases—and they are increases—are made necessary because of public act No. 94, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, approved December 5, 1919, which fixed the salaries of these officers at exactly the amount for which we have reported the appropriation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What act is that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is an act amending the act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia, approved December 5, 1919.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Of course that bill came from the District Committee?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Which committee had no jurisdiction at all, of course, over the Government officers who are under the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. It is an odd circumstance, Mr. Chairman, that a man gets his salary increased from \$950 a year to \$1,700 a year merely by changing his title; and the District Committee, for reasons undoubtedly good to them, but probably without any knowledge of what they were doing, undertook to dispose of the watchmen upon the

reservations in the District of Columbia cared for by the Government, and to put those reservations in the hands of policemen and then fix their salaries on the same basis as the salaries of the regular policemen in the District of Columbia. So that we have increased the pay of a watchman for a few little reservations in the District of Columbia from \$48,410 to \$78,620. Evidently the committee who reported that bill did not at the time know the state of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Did not the gentleman notice that they were called watchmen heretofore; and I wondered by what authority they have changed them to policemen?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The law changed them into police by the bill reported by the District Committee, which includes them in the police of the District. The same thing applies in a number of other cases. It is fortunate, probably, in a way, for the Federal Treasury that the watchman for the care of the monument and dock at Wakefield, Va., who does not have anything to do, for which he gets \$300, that the District Committee did not think of him, or they would have called him a policeman and paid him a policeman's pay.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This committee and the distinguished chairman have agreed to so many important amendments thus far to this bill that probably it would agree to another amendment if offered by the gentleman from Illinois to get this thing straightened out.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish to say to the gentleman from Texas and to the gentleman from Illinois that we have eliminated these gentlemen from the benefits of the bonus and invited all sorts of trouble on our shoulders in consequence of it. But we felt that it was necessary to do it in justice to other employees.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They are now getting double salaries because they were placed in the same plane as the police of the District of Columbia, and if you did not exempt them they would get the bonus in addition to the pay of a policeman of the District of Columbia.

Mr. WASON. They get it for the current year and would have got it for 1921 if it were not for the provision in the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This was discussed in the subcommittee, but it was this House that changed the salary of these men. We are subjected to criticism when we attempt to reduce expenses in these departments where the salaries have been fixed for a number of years and the number of employees for a number of years. In this particular case this very House, this body of men here now, increased the policemen's pay and transferred these park policemen and watchmen who sit around and watch the parks—transferred them into the force of the District of Columbia, giving them the same salaries. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois; I think it is wrong. Still, the committee in discussing this matter did not feel like coming back and asking the House to thrash it all over again.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I fully agree to that, and I think perhaps we are lucky that the District Committee did not report a bill to the House including in the police force all the watchmen in the various departments of the Government. Doubtless if they had thought of it and got it to a vote they would have increased the salary of all the watchmen in the departments.

Mr. Sisson. I thought the explanation was proper in view of the fact that the policemen and firemen seem to be in a class by themselves. But that is not the fault of the committee. We did this because we thought it just and fair.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Was it the judgment of the subcommittee that the legislation was wrong?

Mr. Sisson. I would not undertake to say that all of it was wrong.

Mr. GARRETT. I mean that authorizing this particular appropriation.

Mr. Sisson. No; nothing wrong in that, because the act came from the proper committee; they reclassified the watchmen into the police of the District.

Mr. GARRETT. I know that it is in accord with the law, but was it the opinion of the committee that the law was wrong?

Mr. Sisson. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I do not believe that all the park watchmen, the men that render service of that kind, ought to have been covered into the police force of the District of Columbia, with the salaries of the beat

policemen. I do not undertake to say that in the reclassification the beat policemen have too much salary, but I do not think the park watchmen ought to have been put on the same basis, on the same plane, with the police who perform duties on the beats.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the foregoing amounts appropriated under public buildings and grounds, the sum of \$68,290 shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I assume that this amount, \$68,200, is arithmetically one-half of the appropriation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The amount was put in and made necessary by reason of the watchman at Wakefield, Va.

The Clerk read as follows:

Walker-Johnson Building, 1734 New York Avenue: Engineer, \$1,200; 4 firemen; 4 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 7 watchmen; general mechanic or skilled laborer, \$840; 7 laborers; attendant, \$480; in all, \$17,940.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The chairman will notice that in this paragraph just read there are seven watchmen with no salaries fixed. Was that an omission?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; by section 2 of this bill, page 152, their pay is fixed at \$720 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Here is a watchman provided for on the preceding page at Wakefield, Va., and his salary is fixed at \$300.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. The reason that the watchman at Wakefield, Va.—

Mr. BLANTON. I am not making any comment on that, because we all know why men outside of the District get less than they do in Washington.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is not the only reason.

Mr. BLANTON. All through the bill elsewhere and in the Agricultural bill and other bills I notice that when we provide for a watchman his salary is provided for in a specified amount.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We thought we would save at least a little paper and printer's ink.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, if it is going to save paper, that is all that is necessary for me to know. We should do anything on earth to save print paper, for it is at a premium now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Potomac Park office buildings: For the following employees for the maintenance and protection of the buildings: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 4 of class 1, 4 at \$1,000 each; 4 messengers, at \$720 each; chief engineer, \$1,800; assistant engineers—1 \$1,600, 6 at \$1,400 each; storekeeper, \$1,200; chief electrician, \$1,600; electricians—4 at \$1,400 each, 4 at \$1,200 each; foreman carpenter, \$1,600; carpenters—3 at \$1,400 each, 2 at \$1,200 each; painters—3 at \$1,200 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; plumbers—1 \$1,400, 4 at \$1,200 each; steam fitters—2 at \$1,400 each, 2 at \$1,200 each; machinist, \$1,400; 4 switchboard operators, at \$1,200 each; 6 general mechanics, at \$1,000 each; guards—captain \$1,600, 3 lieutenants at \$1,080 each, 3 sergeants at \$930 each, 30 at \$780 each, 30 at \$720 each; fire marshal, \$1,080; foreman of laborers, \$1,400; 2 assistant foremen of laborers, at \$960 each; 7 foremen or forewomen, at \$780 each; 140 laborers; laborers and charwomen, \$130,000; 22 female laborers, at \$480 each; in all, \$385,330.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have gone over the various items of the temporary buildings with a little care. This particular one I think is not rated as entirely temporary in nature. It is rather more an addition to the Army and Navy general buildings, but from here on in the bill for the next three pages they are entirely temporary war buildings, and I find that the care of these buildings, including the Walker-Hughes Building, on page 83, amounts to the enormous sum of \$1,547,000 a year.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that all told there are 5,000,000 square feet of office space.

Mr. TREADWAY. Are there not now about 9,000,000 square feet, according to the testimony of Col. Ridley—5,000,000 of new space and 4,000,000 formerly? It has increased from 2 buildings to 20, in other words.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I am speaking now of these temporary buildings that the gentleman is talking about. The buildings under his control have increased until the space now amounts to 5,000,000 square feet.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; so he testified. I would like to comment on some statements made by Col. Ridley. I shall not call particular attention to his testimony because I know that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] and his colleagues have gone into this matter very carefully, but I do wish to call attention to the fact that on page 871 of the hearings Mr. Wood asked the question whether these tables showed any reduction in the amount of floor space, now estimated for, from that in use in 1919 and 1920. Col. Ridley replied:

I can answer that now by saying that the floor space is just the same.

And a little later reference was made to various activities moving out of some of these buildings, and inquiry was made as to what becomes of the space in these temporary buildings which are not fireproof and are vacated. He then replied that the Public Building Commission makes a survey at regular periods, and if it finds space that is vacant it assigns some bureau or office from a rented building to that space.

My point is this: Can not we by making very material cuts in this sum of \$1,500,000 for care of these temporary buildings close them up? We are criticized continually upon the ground that we are not cutting down the number of employees. Of course, we will not cut down the number of employees if, to use a slang phrase, there is a continual passing of the buck from the Committee on Appropriations to Col. Ridley, and from Col. Ridley to the Public Building Commission. Can we not get at the source of the use of these buildings and concentrate in such a way as to close them up? For the life of me I can not see why the source of curtailment need not be right here in this appropriation for their care.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I will tell him how the committee has sought to accomplish the purpose that he is now seeking to accomplish. The Committee on Appropriations has nothing to do with rented buildings. It has only to do with the employees that work in those buildings. For the purpose of not only reducing the clerical force but reducing the necessity for space in which to house these clerks, we have so reduced this War Department that next year they will have to dispense with 17,500 employees now occupying these buildings. I expect that by that means we have made it possible to reduce the space.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman feel that as a result of a curtailment of 17,500 employees, to whom he refers, some of these buildings will be abandoned?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They will not be abandoned, then, if those in charge of those activities can hold them.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is exactly what I am getting at.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The only way they can be abandoned is through this commission on allotment of space, whose business it is to make periodical surveys of these buildings for the purpose of consolidating the activities, so that there can be more vacant space. That is the only way whereby this can be ultimately solved. If there is only the head of the bureau and six clerks they will still be trying to occupy the buildings.

Mr. TREADWAY. I agree with the gentleman's statement absolutely. Does the gentleman consider, after due deliberation in the committee, that \$1,547,000 is an economical appropriation for the care of these various 20 buildings during the ensuing year, beginning next July?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do, for the reason that if we did not make it available for those buildings it would have to be made in some degree and in a far larger degree for rented buildings, and, in addition to that, we would have to pay the rent.

Mr. TREADWAY. In reference to the rental of buildings, when these departments or bureaus move from one of the rented buildings, what arrangement is it then possible to make to curtail the use of that building or the payment of that rent? I understand that the committee has not anything to do with it, but how can we get at that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As far as the rented buildings are concerned, if the War Department has rented the building, and it can find space for the activity in a Government-owned building, the lease being made with the War Department, the War Department could sell or assign the lease.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the gentleman know whether any of those rented buildings has ceased to be a source of expense to the Government?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. We have taken it all away that we have jurisdiction over, as I said a while ago, except one, which is a long-term lease, and the rental of that is \$22,500.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, at the end of the fiscal year 1921, as I understand the gentleman, there will be but one rented building in the city of Washington in charge of the War Department. Is that correct?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. So far as the War Department is concerned, this is the only rented building provided for in the bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. Where else are they provided for?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Here is the trouble, and that is one of the things that I tried to point out the other day when

I was speaking generally with reference to this bill. Because of our diversified way of making appropriations, because of the various sources from which moneys may be obtained, they can pay for rented buildings out of these various sums received from other committees.

For instance, out of the appropriation bill brought in by the Committee on Military Affairs they are renting a number of other buildings. We have no control over those at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They are renting separate buildings.

Mr. TREADWAY. Can the gentleman tell me how many employees this \$1,547,000 provides for? What number of employees for these 20 buildings are provided for in this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, the number carried in this bill just offhand I could not tell. The gentleman will find in reference to every one of these buildings the exact number of people who are employed in them, but there are so many in them I could not carry the total in my mind.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, when we come to criticize these various appropriations there is always some other source of leakage somewhere else where the actual blame may rest, and it does not apply at the very point where we are trying to criticize at the time—another argument in behalf of concentration through the budget system?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Absolutely, and it always will be until that is accomplished.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is until some system of a budget is provided?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have felt repeatedly it would be the greatest blessing that could ever befall the American Government if by some magic our machinery could be dropped out in one night and some business system adopted the next morning. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I can not do it myself, because I feel I have not the information to make an intelligent motion, but I am in favor of starting right here by cutting off some of this \$1,547,000 and seeing if these buildings down there can not be handled with fewer employees than that large sum of the taxpayers' money will employ.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to concur in what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. The chairman of the committee, I note, is threatening to have economy after the expiration of another year from the 1st of July. It seems to me that the place to start is the 1st of July of this year instead—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield? That is exactly where we start.

Mr. DOWELL. But the gentleman is appropriating in this bill for one year beginning the 1st of July.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of this coming July; yes.

Mr. DOWELL. But in this bill the gentleman concedes he has not economized all he should.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; we do not concede that.

Mr. DOWELL. But the gentleman threatens to do that the year following by making preparations in this bill—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; we do not do that. If the gentleman will read what we appropriated for the same things last year, he will find that we have made a very great reduction here.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the gentleman decreased the expenditure for the Potomac Park office building for this year?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. I do not know how many hundreds, but we have gone into the thousands in the reduction of those employed in this building. We have reduced the clerical force that are provided for now in the Potomac Building alone more than \$100,000, approaching very nearly \$125,000.

Mr. DOWELL. But the gentleman is appropriating in this bill for a complete outfit of employees to take care of all the space which was occupied during any part of the war.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; we have not. Now, the gentleman understands we have no jurisdiction over the space.

Mr. DOWELL. But he is appropriating in this bill everything so far as taking care of this building is concerned and giving to the War Department the same space that they had during the war.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; but by reason of the fact of the diminished appropriation we are making it impossible for them to have the horde of men employed they now have in that building. Listen for a moment. When they are released from the pay roll it is going to make more space down there.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, why have the same number of clerks, messengers, and attendants to take care of this building?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, we are not. There is just the trouble with the gentleman. In that one building alone we have reduced the number of employees whose salaries would amount to practically \$100,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman answer a further question?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. This is the point I am getting at. I do not know how many clerks have been reduced in this building, but I am inquiring about the number of employees to take care of the building.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. And the space that is going to be occupied—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We have reduced—

Mr. DOWELL. Just a moment. If the gentleman has made the reduction in the clerical force he says has been made, the department will not occupy the same space it did and will not require the same number of employees to take care of the department that it did during the war.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, in our opinion, to the tune of \$99,470.

Mr. DOWELL. But the gentleman is making the same appropriation here for attendants for taking care of the department in that building?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; we are not. We are making an appropriation of \$99,470 less.

Mr. DOWELL. And that is clerical force?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; that is not clerical force. That is watchmen, charwomen, and everybody that has to do with the taking care of the building.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is the Potomac Park office building now under consideration?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The total appropriation for the current year carried in the bill, unless there have been deficiency appropriations, was \$290,420. This bill carries \$385,330, nearly \$100,000 more, instead of \$100,000 less.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish to call the gentleman's attention—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no doubt there is some explanation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Here is a deficiency appropriation of \$196,000, and another of \$19,308, and—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Not for this building.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Absolutely for the Potomac Park Building.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, not for this one building.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; for this one building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOWELL. One more question. Under this system of appropriation by the committee how is there to be a reduction if you appropriate for all the employees for taking care of all the space that the department desires to occupy? Have you not a remedy by refusing this appropriation?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We would have no justification for refusing the entire appropriation.

Mr. DOWELL. But, when the gentleman states that he knows they are occupying more space than they should occupy, and when he states that he knows they are expending more money than they ought to expend, is it not possible for the committee then to see that this appropriation is reduced and stop some of this unnecessary appropriation?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have said half a dozen times that we have reduced it for this one building alone \$99,470, practically \$100,000. We have reduced it with reference to every one of these buildings until, as I say, in the War Department, from first to last, we have cut out 17,500 employees.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 84, lines 5 and 6, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Iowa what I believe to be the cause of all of this trouble. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, we will all agree, has an intimate knowledge concerning the clerical force of this Government, the other day told us that we had 40,000 unnecessary, idle employees here in the city of Washington alone. He did not say he believed we had them; he said we had them, as a matter of fact. And there are at least 40,000 of them idle, but still drawing salaries. I will tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] why we have them, and why we are going to continue to have them, and why this committee still keeps them on the pay roll. It is because we can not get rid of them by reason of the fact that many departments are afraid to discharge them and the Civil Service Commission is taking on new ones faster than we can get rid of the old ones.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I want to give him some information that he may not have.

This morning I got hold of a printed appeal. It is about a foot wide and is about a foot and a half or two feet long, on great big, thick cardboard, just issued by the Civil Service Commission, appealing to the young men and the young women of this country to take the civil-service examinations in order to get them into the employ of the Government.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just one minute. I want to get this information before the committee. I am glad to see that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] has seemingly awakened up on this proposition, and I hope he will get the committees stirred up on it, because they need to be stirred up.

Here we have 40,000 useless, idle employees, clock-watching all the time, with nothing to do, yet on the pay roll, regularly drawing their salaries and bonuses, and we are trying to get rid of them by lip movement only, and here is the Civil Service Commission appealing to the country for thousands of new clerks to be examined in order to get on the roll on a civil-service status. The commission goes on to tell them what high salaries will be paid and tells them that they will get the \$240 bonus, and that the bonus may be changed, and all that, in order to induce them to take the examination. If we have not any use for 40,000 idle ones already on the pay roll, let us transfer them where they may have something to do, and not take on any new ones and keep adding to the list all the time. The papers regularly tell us each month that last month we sent so many clerks home and that we took on so many new ones, and that the new ones equal almost the old ones that we sent home.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. The Republican whip is getting active again. He has the right idea, and his Republican colleagues ought to get in behind him and support him.

I want to show this to you. I have just had my secretary bring me this printed appeal I mentioned, having telephoned for it. Just look at this appeal to the country. That is what the Civil Service Commission is sending out. [Exhibiting circular.] Look at it. Look at the number of positions they are asking to be filled while there are already 40,000 useless, idle employees now on the pay rolls doing nothing. Why, when we built all these new war buildings down here in Potomac Park that run southwest from the Pan American Building, running nearly a half mile in length, on both sides of that avenue down to the Lincoln Monument, we understood when the war was over they would be taken away, yet they are still there, and we are still keeping them peopled with an army of useless, idle employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, now I yield to the gentleman, my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I want to make this observation: If the other members of the gentleman's party were as economically disposed as he is, there would not be any deficit in the Government's expenses this year.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman's own party, that is now in the majority, that has the whip hand or control of legislation, would just turn the matter over to the distinguished Republican whip and myself for solution, we would know what to do, and do it by dismissing all useless, unnecessary employees from the service, and we would send these 40,000 useless, idle clerks home to-morrow.

Mr. KNUTSON. But Congress has nothing to do with the hiring of these clerks, I will say to my friend.

Mr. BLANTON. I know Congress has nothing to do with it, because Mr. Gompers will not let you have anything to do with it. If you were to discharge one to-morrow he would make you take him back the next day or he would put you out of Congress.

Here in my own paper, the Daily Abilene Reporter, is a whole page advertisement, seven full columns of printed matter, that Mr. Gompers paid for last Sunday, attacking me and vilifying me in my home city. Look at it. That is what a Member gets for opposing Gompers. He said he was going to spend \$100,000 to put me out of Congress, and it seems that he has begun. Look at that page advertisement. It probably cost him about \$300. And already he is having sent from Washington articles to some of the other 67 papers in my district, and he is getting articles attacking me put in a number of Texas papers. That is why Congress can not get rid of them, I will say to my good friend, the ever-active whip on this side of the House. You Republicans in power have got to wake up and you have got to cut these fellows loose, whether their organizations want you to do it or not. You Republicans have got to quit keeping your ear to the ground when they come in and ask you to give them a bonus of \$480 a year, instead of \$240, for seven hours' service per day. Are you going to do it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel, lights, repairs, motor cycle and truck repairs, supplies, and exchange of same, miscellaneous items, printing, and city directories, \$200,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I notice in all the items for the maintenance of these various temporary structures we have been referring to there is an appropriation for city directories. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if we could not at least economize by buying fewer city directories for these 22 buildings that are in use around the city? I find that the telephone book makes a pretty good city directory, anyway, but here in this item we have "city directories," on page 84, and we have got "city directories" in many places elsewhere in the bill. Every single building, it seems, carries with it the item "fuel, light, repairs, ground rent, miscellaneous items, and city directories."

Mr. DOWELL. That is possibly for the amusement of some of the employees who have nothing to do.

Mr. TREADWAY. They probably want some of the employees to distribute the city directories. I can not see any other use for them.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It does not necessarily follow that each of these departments has a city directory.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, why not strike them out?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Wait a moment. These can not be purchased without specific authority. They do not all have city directories. Without this specific authority none could be purchased. They could not buy a single city directory. I expect the gentleman would admit that there ought to be some.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does that refer to the local city directories, or does it refer to city directories throughout the country that they want to buy? How many city directories are there under this appropriation?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It is not to be supposed that these people are doing nothing but senseless things. It may be supposed that some of the things they do are sensible. Take the Bureau of Statistics in the Department of Labor. They probably need a city directory. None of these items mentioned here can be purchased without specific authority, so that, for the purpose of enabling those who of necessity require these items, they are provided for in this way.

Mr. TREADWAY. Do the hearings of the committee carry any reference to this one item? Does anybody testify as to what they are going to do with all these city directories for all these buildings?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think on investigation the gentleman will find that in this department they have spent very little for books and city directories. In this department I can inform the gentleman that they spent \$40.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to get the information. It relieves my feelings considerably.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Inasmuch as the gentleman from Massachusetts has begun his serious campaign for reducing expenditures, I desire to ask him if, in striking out the appropriation for city directories, he intends to strike out any appropriation for blot-
[Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, they make blotting paper in my country, and I do not know that I will take that trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Temporary office buildings: For employees for the maintenance and protection of the temporary office buildings known as War Trade Building, between B and C Streets and Twentieth and Twenty-first Streets NW.; Food Administration Building No. 1, between Eighteenth and Nineteenth Streets and C and D Streets NW.; Food Administration Building No. 2, between New York Avenue and D Street and Nineteenth and Twentieth Streets NW.; Council of National Defense Building, on Eighteenth Street between C and D Streets NW.; Fuel Administration Buildings Nos. 1 and 2, bounded by Virginia Avenue, Eighteenth, and C Streets NW.; Fuel Administration Building No. 3, on D Street, between Twentieth and Twenty-first Streets NW.; H. L. Pettus Building, on Nineteenth Street, between Virginia Avenue and D Street NW.; Archie Butt Building, 1725 New York Avenue NW.; and Corcoran Courts Building, on New York Avenue, between Seventeenth and Eighteenth Streets NW.: Assistant superintendent, \$2,000; principal clerk, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 3 of class 1; 2 messengers at \$840 each; chief electrician, \$1,600; electricians—1 \$1,400, 4 at \$1,200 each; foreman carpenter, \$1,600; carpenters—1 \$1,400, 5 at \$1,200 each; plumbers—1, \$1,400, 3 at \$1,200 each; steamfitter, \$1,400; painters—3 at \$1,200 each; 1, \$1,000; 8 general mechanics at \$1,000 each; assistant engineers—1, \$1,400; 3 at \$1,200 each; 18 firemen at \$840 each; 11 coal passers at \$720 each; guards—captain, \$1,600, 3 lieutenants at \$1,080 each, 12 sergeants at \$900 each, 120 privates, at \$780 each; fire marshal, \$1,200; foreman of laborers \$1,000; 2 assistant foremen of laborers, at \$840 each; 7 foremen or forewomen, at \$720 each; 60 laborers; 6 female laborers, at \$480 each; laborers and charwomen, \$60,000; in all, \$296,760.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to inquire for what purpose any buildings enumerated on page 86 are now used? Reference is made to the Food Administration, the Council for National Defense, and two or three buildings for the Fuel Administration, and other activities, war activities, some of which at least I had hoped had gone out of being before this time. I really think we ought to know for what purpose those buildings are used at present and whether or not there is any chance of closing them up before they themselves fall down, and in that way prevent further use.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I would state in answer to the gentleman's question that in the item just passed are included the Commerce Department, the Compensation Commission, the Agricultural Department, the Council of National Defense, housing 380 people; the War Department, Wheat Director, 509 people; Labor Department, 156 people; Federal Trade Commission and Civil Service Commission, 303 people; War Department, 466 people; War Department again, 417 people; State and War Departments, 909 people; and War Department, 440 people.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to get that information. From the gentleman's investigations does he consider that all these various departments to which he has referred need the number of employees he has read off?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say that we have given in this bill the best result of our judgment, and I would invite the gentleman's attention to the 2,858 pages of hearings which record the evidence upon which the judgment of this committee was based. It is wonderfully illuminating, and if the gentleman will read it he can draw conclusions of his own, based on facts rather than on conjecture.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to give the gentleman from Massachusetts a little light on one of these buildings that he has asked about. It is the Food Administration Building. I have a letter from Mr. Hoover that he wrote me while he was here in Washington as Food Administrator in answer to a letter I wrote him making inquiry as to whether it was true, as the rumor had it, that he had paid an enormous sum, running up into over a score of thousands of dollars, more for rental per year for his

office building than the lady who had the building under rent was paying at the time he took it over, and furthermore allowing the owner of the building to move out all of the furniture rented by the lady with the building and refurnishing it from top to bottom with new furniture at Government expense. I would like to get that letter into the Record in connection with my remarks, showing the gentleman from Massachusetts just how many more thousands of dollars this great Food Administrator agreed to pay out of the Treasury than a private person was paying when he opened up his office here in Washington. I have his letter over his own signature admitting that he paid even more than the rumor charged him with. I want to say that just that one little act alone of the gentleman, who has the reputation of having made a very distinguished Food Administrator, but who has very little idea about proper American economy, would keep me from supporting him for President of the United States, even if he were a Democrat and had resided in this country long enough, because we need an economical President to be elected in the next election to help us pay this country out of debt.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with my remarks, pertinent to the inquiry made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record the letter from Mr. Hoover concerning the matter I have just mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record the letter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. BURKE. I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is very familiar with Government activities and offers a great many suggestions here. I should like to ask him if he can offer any suggestion in addition to that offered by the chairman of the subcommittee as to how we can dispense with the use of some of these buildings?

Mr. BLANTON. Close them up. Get PHIL CAMPBELL, the ever-ready chairman of the Rules Committee, to bring in a rule to-morrow morning, just like he brought in a rule this morning, and just like last month he had his hip pocket full of rules, which he brought out every time you fellows over there wanted one—have him bring in a rule here to pass proper legislation to either properly utilize or tear those war buildings down and send their idle occupants home and get rid of them and stop the expense.

Mr. TREADWAY. I will join the gentleman in asking the chairman of the Rules Committee—

Mr. BLANTON. Well, you would have a devilish hard time getting your steering committee to bring in a rule of that kind. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In regard to the use of these buildings, the Committee on Agriculture every year has to consider the matter of an appropriation for rent of buildings for the department, and during this current year the department has had space assigned to it and is occupying all the space so assigned, and in addition to such space—all available space in temporary buildings being occupied—it has found it necessary to rent about 40 buildings in the city and to pay approximately \$270,000 in rents. If there were more of these so-called temporary buildings available and fit for occupancy, the rent to be paid by departments would be less than it is. A number of the activities of the Department of Agriculture are carried on in the buildings which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would like to have torn down and destroyed. Such of the buildings as are fit for use are occupied and are being put to a good use. They are not all suitable. I have in mind some buildings used by a department that are not convenient or entirely suitable, but the department is putting up with them, very much embarrassed in carrying on its work. These temporary buildings are occupied because they are there and in order to save the Government the expense of renting other buildings.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman from Michigan tell us concerning the use of the great buildings down on Potomac Park, just below the Pan American Building, down toward the Lincoln Memorial? There are about half a mile of those buildings on each side of that avenue. Can the gentleman tell us for what purpose they are used now?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not know the particular purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish the gentleman would go down there and find out. The Agricultural Department does not use them.

Let us take some of those buildings that were built for war purposes and transfer the occupants of some of these rented buildings to them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been so busy with real work, taking care of committee work and giving attention to proceedings on the floor, not reading newspapers or preparing remarks like some I have listened to—

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is not here any more than I am—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have been so busy doing real work that I have not had an opportunity lately to go down into that part of the city; but I understand those buildings are all occupied by assignments made by a commission appointed by the last Congress, the duty of that commission being to determine which of the buildings are suitable for use and to assign them to the departments which can best use them. I have no doubt that those buildings have been investigated and that they have been assigned to departments that need them and can use them. The committee of which I am a member has had considerable difficulty with the question of rents and of finding accommodations for the many offices of the department. The matter of rent is just now a serious proposition. Our committee has insisted that the department, when it must have space in addition to buildings owned by the Government, should occupy these temporary buildings or other property owned by the Government, as far as possible, and it is pursuing that course; but in spite of all that, as I say, the department is occupying 40 rented buildings and paying \$270,000 a year rental for them.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to about an hour's discussion of this question of surplus space in Government buildings, and I am no more enlightened than I was when the discussion began.

It is so easy upon the floor of this House to deal in generalities, without a specific statement of fact, that I fear it has become such a habit that reform is impossible. One would like to know definitely first as to whether any space is ever assigned except by specific authorization of law.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I appreciate what the gentleman has just stated about the difficulty of getting specific information. As the gentleman reads the hearings, which indicate an honest effort on the part of the committee to get the facts, is he satisfied with the facts that are stated to the committee? I am not. I think the committee are without information, although an honest effort was made to get it. And what I am concerned about is how are we to get the information in reference to these buildings? If a number of buildings erected to take care of the accessories of the war are still occupied, what are we to do? I am wondering whether it is not the purpose of those who are interested in occupying those buildings to conceal rather than to reveal the facts of the case.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I have read a part of the hearings, and I confess that the committee seem to be without definite information that would justify them in making wholesale cuts in the appropriation.

Mr. FESS. That is the point exactly.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Therefore, rather than cripple seriously any particular department of the Government, they must take what are said to be the necessities of the particular bureau or department.

If it be true that there can be no space occupied save by specific authorization, it would seem to be the function of the committee that authorizes that space to report to the House the conditions that obtain at this time. If there be discretion on the part of the department, I suppose a letter addressed to the department specifically requesting the amount of floor space at the time of the war, the amount now occupied, and the probable occupation for the future ought to bring that knowledge.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, if you sent out that kind of a letter, it would be very easy to tell the amount of floor space they originally had and the amount now occupied, and they would give you the number of square feet they originally occupied and say that it is all occupied.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. So we seem to be in a position where it is impossible to get the knowledge.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WASON. In relation to what the gentleman has said about the hearings and in line with what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] said, I want to say that your committee, after examining these men closely, found ourselves without

absolute definite knowledge except as to the floor space, rental, and so forth, and we took upon ourselves the duty of going and using our eyes and seeing for ourselves. But time did not permit us to make a survey of the whole situation. We got some information which we felt was beneficial, and that was a guide to our subsequent action which is reported to this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. For that reason, gentlemen, I am inclined to follow the committee upon matters in which they have recently striven to give an opinion; their time was limited. They have been compelled to go in the dark, perhaps blindly to some extent, and use their best judgment. Certainly they are better informed upon this complex matter than any other Member of the House can be by a cursory discussion of the question as it has been presented this afternoon. Pardon me for taking the extra time, but really this matter was discussed last year and has been discussed for more than an hour this year and we have gotten nowhere. I wonder if we can not proceed a little more rapidly on the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana who has just concluded says that in this discussion no light had been shed on this question. I shall not entertain the hope that I shall meet the gentleman's expectations in that regard. But I do want to point out one thing along the line suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. We had very little trouble in demobilizing our military Army, but it seems that we are having a great deal of trouble in demobilizing our peace-time army down in the departments. [Laughter and applause.]

I am not charging the responsibility for the demobilization of the Army on either the Democratic side alone or on the Republican side alone, because, while that side has been talking a great deal the last two years about the immense number of clerks in the departments that ought to be sent home, on that side the present discussion has disclosed that those gentlemen have not been able to solve the problem.

I am not making a partisan appeal, because we all know, whether Democrats or Republicans, the public service possesses an adhesiveness that is very hard to overcome. It has been found even to affect Members of Congress to the extent that when they get here they do not want to go back home to civil and private life. One reason the clerks have not been reduced is because every clerk in the departments of the Government solicits his Congressman to take care of his constituent, and when they are threatened with being turned out by the executive department of the Government they beat a trail to the office of their Member of Congress, and he immediately interests himself in trying to get that clerk, if he be discharged, put into another branch of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said every Member of Congress, and I deny that is true as far as I am concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know whether I used the word "every" in relation to a Member of Congress. I said every clerk trailed to the office of his Member of Congress. I will except the gentleman from Illinois from that. I do not mean to make the wholesale charge, but it is a charge we all know is well merited in some cases. I will not say that the gentleman from Illinois, or even his side of the House, is any more subject to that influence than our side; but it is a matter of common observation that that is true. The gentleman from Illinois is excepted in that respect, and in many other respects, from the common run of Congressmen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I want to say on that point that the clerks should be transferred to other departments if there are any places in the other departments. If there were no places in the other departments, of course there would be no transference. So I suppose ultimately it rests on this body to determine how many places there are to be filled.

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure. That is what I was coming to. I trust the membership will not take it that I meant that everybody undertook to do this, but I meant that it was the natural inclination to transfer his clerk to another department if there should be a place in the other department for him.

Mr. MADDEN. There is another statement which I think ought to be excepted. "Their clerk" presupposes that every Member has a clerk in the departments, and I deny that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will again except the gentleman from Illinois from that classification and repeat my statement that he is to be excepted.

Mr. BEE. Why has not the gentleman made a general exception of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to say I would except him from all of the rules that apply to the common, ordinary Congressman and put him above the ordinary run on a pinnacle, where he belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] wanted to know how we are going to find out about these clerks. We hear on the floor of this House from day to day that there are literally thousands of clerks in the departments who are not needed. To-day the gentleman from Iowa said that there were thousands of them down there that ought to be turned out, and yet from day to day we have appropriation bills brought in here by the majority side of this House making appropriations for those very clerks. There may be thousands, and I do not doubt that there are many hundreds, if not thousands, of clerks in the departments who could be spared, and for the purpose of arriving at the needs of the service I commend to the majority of this House a joint resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], now pending before the Committee on Rules. This joint resolution provides for the appointment of a joint committee of the Members of the House and the Senate, whose duty it shall be to make a survey of this very matter and determine where in the various departments economies may be brought about by the reduction of their clerical forces and by a reduction of the activities of the departments.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. Gentlemen on the Republican side of the House admit, as did the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], the chairman of the congressional committee, ignorance respecting these matters on the Republican side of the House, and if so diligent and so studious a Member of the House as is the gentleman from Ohio is ignorant about conditions, then it is not surprising that most Members are ignorant of the particular needs of the various departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman has referred to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] with reference to investigating the departments to ascertain whether or not they have more clerks than are necessary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Have we not now an investigating committee of both the House and Senate on expenditures in every department of the Government?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is the duty of those committees to make these investigations.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have some innocuous, colorless, idle committees on expenditures in the departments, with the exception of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, and there we have a very active political organization.

Mr. DALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DALE. Does the gentleman include all of the other expenditure committees in this phrase "innocuous and useless committees"?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use the word "useless." I said innocuous in the sense that they are comatose; they are laboring under a certain lassitude and inactivity.

Mr. DALE. I know of one committee some members of which are spending at least half their time every day investigating this same subject.

Mr. CONNALLY. To be sure. They are not only spending time but they are spending a great deal of money. I understand from one source that there are now supposed to be functioning 93 inquisitorial committees and subcommittees, including those

in both the Senate and the House, investigating the doings of the War Department and other departments of the Government. The point I am coming to is that we ought to go about this matter in some intelligent way. The Republicans are responsible, and we will share with them that responsibility if they go about it intelligently and get a commission to investigate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I think I seldom have listened to a speech that had as many inaccuracies condensed in the same length of time as the one just made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and I might stop there. The gentleman assumes that the work of Members of Congress apparently is mainly looking after clerks in the departments, and I presume he speaks from his own personal experience or observation. I have been here a great many years, and I never have paid any attention whatever to the matter of clerks in the departments, so far as the individual clerk is concerned and his or her retention or otherwise. I have known few Members of Congress who gave it any time or attention at all. It may be that when a new Member comes here he is worked by some clerk, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] evidently has been; but after a Member has been here a little while he finds that he has something else to do besides running to the departments to have a clerk retained or appointed, and if he has anything at all to do he will have something better to do, because that will not have any effect, besides not being his duty.

The gentleman said there has been no effort to reduce the number of clerks in these departments. Evidently he was not in the Hall when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] stated on a number of occasions that his bill proposes to reduce the number of clerks in the departments by 21,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Secretary: Secretary of the Navy, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,000; private secretary to Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to Secretary, \$2,250; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, \$2,400; clerk to Assistant Secretary, \$2,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,250; appointment clerk, \$2,250; printing clerk, \$2,000; stenographers—1 \$1,800, 1 \$1,200; clerks—1 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 5 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 1 \$1,100, 6 at \$1,000 each, 1 \$900; carpenter, \$1,000; 4 messengers; 4 assistant messengers; 3 laborers; messenger boys—4 at \$600 each, 2 at \$480 each; in all, \$78,830.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. I suppose it would now be proper for me to go off into the cloakroom and coil up on a sofa somewhere, after incurring the legislative wrath and displeasure of the nestor of the Republican side of the House. I should have known that, no matter how I framed my remarks, not because it was I, but because I happen to be not so old in the service—

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. WASON. I want to assist the gentleman and to assure him that when he makes the statement that our colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the nestor of the House he is inaccurate.

Mr. BLANTON. He is a nestor in reference to information and general knowledge.

Mr. WASON. That is not what the gentleman stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. I might have known I should have incurred the gentleman's wrath, not from my personality but by reason of not having served in the House as long as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and because of being a comparatively new Member. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I tried in my remarks simply to say that it was the natural and human thing for a Member of Congress to assist a constituent in being transferred from one department to another if there was a vacancy. I do not profess any virtue in that regard myself. I will state, however, to the gentleman from Illinois that I have turned down several applications of the very kind that he mentioned on the ground that the force of clerks had to be reduced.

Service in a great legislative body for a long number of years is something of which to be proud, but if that were the only reason by which a man could claim distinction I take it it would be one necessarily to be scorned. If I shall ever have the honor to remain in this House for a great many years, and during that time I shall acquire the distinction that the gentleman from Illinois possesses, if I shall acquire the skill which he possesses in legislative matters, it certainly shall be beneath my dignity to scorn any Member of this House, whether he is a new Member or any other, simply because he has not remained here until his whiskers drag the ground [applause], or else because he is simply a new man. Service here does not depend upon its length of time. Every constituency is entitled to its representation. In my statement a moment ago I did not attribute blame to the gentleman's side of the House more

than to any other, and I did not make the charge that no reduction of clerks had been had in the departments, but I stated that the complaint had been made to-day by the gentleman from Iowa that no reduction of clerks had been made. I appealed to the House to adopt some intelligent method of appointing a commission to investigate so that the clerks could be reduced. I for one, with all respect to the gentleman from Illinois, take exception to his fling at myself or any other Member simply because we happen to be new Members. At one time the gentleman from Illinois was a new Member. At one time he was new to these legislative halls; and but for the experience that he got here, associating with other new Members, he would not be able now to stand in his place, with all of his honors clustering about him, with all the plaudits of the people hanging about his well-merited shoulders, he would not be able to stand here and fling at some Member who is less conspicuous than he, some Member who is trying to serve his constituents faithfully and diligently. I marvel not that the gentleman is not now occupying the station of the Speaker of this House. If the manners which he exhibited here to-day were employed in his conduct toward gentlemen on the Republican side of the House during the days of his ascendancy, I marvel not that they resented such conduct and displaced him by electing another to that coveted honor, to which I doubt not during all of these 20 years he has looked, even though at a distance, with longing eye and watering mouth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the very large amount of money carried under the Navy Department for temporary employees in the various departments. It seems to me that here is one of the items that always gets us into trouble, these lump-sum appropriations for temporary employees. I notice, in the first place, that the Secretary of the Navy for his office has \$56,600, and then naval operations has \$56,700. It is surprising to see how near those two amounts are alike. I believe, unless there is some special reason that the chairman of the committee could give us, that here would be a good opportunity to begin to cut down the appropriations and be absolutely sure to rid ourselves of some of these unnecessary clerks that you hear so much talk about, for as far as I can find out it is temporary employees who fill up the offices and are engaged in work that is least essential. I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say upon that subject, and if it is not possible to cut some of these lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the gentleman, and also for the committee, I desire to state that the total estimate asked for by this department was \$1,788,810. The total allowance by your committee was \$1,422,920. The total appropriation for the last year was \$3,268,922.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. We have made a reduction in the Navy Department of \$1,846,002, as compared with last year. I desire to say in reference to lump-sum appropriations that I agree with the gentleman that lump-sum appropriations should be guarded very carefully. But here is the situation that confronted us: The Navy Department, the War Department, and all the other departments that had these extraordinary activities during the war came before the committee and asked to have transferred to the statutory roll the clerks who were carried upon the temporary roll whom they still desired to retain in governmental employment.

We were of the opinion, knowing by reason of past experience how hard it is to get a man off the permanent or statutory roll, that it would be better to carry in the next year or until we can see our way clear to provide such places for such additions as we may find to be necessary, that until this temporary work is entirely disposed of it would be the part of wisdom and the part of economy still to provide for temporary employment. As I have stated, we have reduced the amount of the expenditure this year \$1,846,002.

Mr. MADDEN. How does that compare with the estimate?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As I have stated, we reduced the estimate from \$1,788,810 to \$1,422,920, or a reduction of some \$366,000.

Mr. MADDEN. And if you reduced it about a million more it would not have been far off.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Then we would not have a Navy at all, and I think we still have use for a Navy.

Mr. SNELL. The chairman has struck on the point I had in mind. They are trying to carry a great many of these war-time activities in peace times. Now, I believe that the proportion for peace times for temporary employment of \$1,422,000 as compared with the war-time expenditure for temporary employees is altogether too large.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNELL. The only way we will ever cut down the number of these employees is by refusing to appropriate. For instance, the Hydrographic Office is given \$100,000 for temporary employees.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will state in reference to the Hydrographic Office that we did not give them anywhere near the amount of the appropriation they desired, but that office is doing a wonderful work and must of necessity continue to do it. They furnish all the maps and charts for all the vessels, and they are constantly changing, too, by reason of the new activities in which we are engaging by reason of the change in world conditions, and there is a good deal more necessity for the Hydrographic Department than there ever has been before. In my opinion we cut that department as low as we could possibly cut it without absolutely crippling the present necessities.

Mr. SNELL. It seems that those activities might be cut still further for this immediate time.

Now, there is \$10,000 for employees for the Naval Observatory. What more activities have they now than they previously had? I honestly believe, without crippling the departments of the Government, we could cut down these lump-sum appropriations some 50 per cent, and that would give them \$750,000 for the present year for temporary employees. And I believe that would then give them a reasonable amount so that they could have all the extra employees absolutely necessary under present conditions, and that is all we ought to do at the present time. One thing the people insist upon, and that is that we must cut down the employees in Washington. It seems to me that this is the proper place to begin, and I do not think the \$400,000 from what they ask for is enough of a cut. I fully appreciate the work the committee has done in this matter, only I want to go still further in this direction.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will turn to page 98 he will see there is a provision for temporary employees in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts for \$350,000.

Mr. SNELL. The chairman of the committee says there is practically a million and a half granted for temporary employees, and it does strike me that in justice to the departments and everything else we might cut these down at this time. I would like to see an amendment offered to cut each one of these appropriations for temporary employees 50 per cent.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Before we start any cutting here we ought to have some basis of action. In the first place, before any of these estimates were brought in the Secretary of the Navy reduced the estimates made by the heads of these bureaus to him very, very materially. They wanted, in some cases, twice the amount that the Secretary of the Navy requested that we give them. And I wish to say here, in all fairness to the Secretary of the Navy, he is the only head of any of these departments that was really trying to help the committee to reduce expenses. I think it is fair to say that of Secretary Daniels. However, I wish to say, in addition to that, that the Post Office Department did likewise. With these two exceptions, we received no help from any department in our efforts at reduction.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not the habit of the departments to make estimates a great deal larger than they expect, because they know the committees of the House will cut them down?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think that may be true in some instances, but not in all.

Mr. SNELL. And you have only cut their estimates for employees 20 per cent, on your own statement. I believe they could be cut more than that and allow the department to do good work.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If you can give us the basis for that cut, well and good. But I will tell you where it would be absolutely fatal.

You asked with reference to the \$10,000 for the Naval Observatory. You will remember that during the war we were absolutely without binoculars. We appealed to the Nation to furnish us with these much-needed instruments. They came from all parts of the country. This \$10,000 is for gathering them up and sending them back to the owners, a duty, I think, which should be carried out, because the people supplied us with these instruments that we were absolutely in need of. The largest item in this appropriation is \$404,140, for the Bureau of Navigation. That is by reason of a duty imposed upon that bureau similar to the one on The Adjutant General a few weeks ago for the purpose of gathering the statistics and gathering the history of each man who was engaged in naval service and marine service during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. May I proceed for five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] is recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If we were to take and cut that 50 per cent, we would simply deprive them of the necessary clerical force to do the work that we have already imposed upon them, and so it is all down the list.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if there are not some clerks there now who can do that work without adding these extra employees? The war is over. There should be some people down there who were employed before the war activities began who could give some of their attention to this peace-time business.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. In our judgment, even with the estimate given by the Secretary of the Navy before us, we have made considerable cuts. As I say, we cut it even below the estimates submitted by Secretary Daniels himself, who had very materially cut the estimates submitted to him by the heads of the bureaus. We cut it below the estimates of the Secretary of the Navy, who was very conservative, to the amount of \$366,000.

Mr. SNELL. What harm would it be to this country if some of this work were not done immediately, if we just cut down to rock-bottom and start it all over again?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish the gentleman would specify.

Mr. SNELL. Well, this information that the gentleman says must be compiled. If that was not done now, what harm would come?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It can be more easily furnished now, when these records are at hand, and when the information of these officers who were in charge of the work can be obtained, from temporary officers and men who have not yet been discharged, who can give the benefit of their information to those who are compiling these items. It can be more economically done now than later on. Years after the close of the Civil War information similar to this was furnished to the War Department and to the Navy Department, and it was almost impossible to gather it by reason of the fact that importance was not attached to the papers containing the information when the war closed, and in consequence the papers were not saved, and many of them were lost entirely and secondary information had to be taken instead. If this information is desired, it would be wise to have it furnished now.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I have not injected myself much into this debate, because I am anxious for the early passage of this bill, but I think the criticism made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is an unjust one.

In the first place, the chairman of the committee is correctly stating that the Bureau of Navigation had placed upon it by Congress the duty of keeping the record of every sailor and marine on all our ships and in the navy yards. Now, we would be very derelict in our duty if we did not furnish to this department the amount of money necessary to keep the records of those boys, and I do not think that any man on either side of the House would deny the necessary amount of money. We were simply acting in accordance with the specific wish and will, not only of this body but of the Senate, because that was the law; and it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to carry out the manifest wish and will of the House, as expressed in prior legislation. It is a duty that we owe to the soldiers and sailors and marines. Nobody said anything in opposition to the performance of our duty with regard to the soldiers in the Army. These boys in the Navy are on the same footing. Their records should be kept, and it requires a great deal of work to do it, and we want the record of each of these sailors and marines to be absolutely correct.

Another thing, the number of ships controlled by the Navy has been doubled. The various kinds of craft have had to be cared for. The property purchased during the war has to be disposed of. There are millions and millions of dollars' worth of this property. Shall we abandon this property? Shall we let this property be wasted? Shall we abandon these ships? It would be the worst sort of mistaken economy.

I want again, as I did in the opening of this debate, to congratulate the House and the country in having a chairman who has the nerve and the courage that this chairman has, because he has fearlessly used the paring knife; and if he is to be criticized and if I am to be criticized, it may be that we have cut a little too deeply in some places.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. Sisson. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. How many clerks and employees have you cut out of the Navy Department?

Mr. Sisson. I can not tell you the exact number. I do not carry those things in my head. But I think the gentleman's criticism is not founded upon facts or knowledge. It is a criticism made without having an iota of information. Yet we spent months in getting the facts upon which we based our action. In view of the fact that your chairman has acted with so much courage and patriotism, I do not think it is becoming on the part of gentlemen on that side of the House to criticize the chairman of your committee on your side of the House, who worked patiently and who remained here when others of you were taking holidays during the Christmas time while he was here doing his duty by the House, by the country, and by the Treasury.

And whatever else may be said, if any economy has been practiced in this bill he is entitled to infinitely more credit for it than any other Member on that side of the House, even including the subcommittee members with him. He has been patient, laborious, and courageous in doing his duty, and I want to congratulate the country again upon the kind of work that he has done, and upon the kind of public servant that it has in the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are halfway through this bill. We have been discussing it for a week. I am wondering if it is so important to discuss these matters out of order that it is necessary to discuss them further now before we go on with the reading of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman, as usual, is accommodating.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Just before the gentleman came in we used the last two or three hours in discussing the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I should like to hear the bill read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel, oil, grease, pipe, wire, and other materials needed for the maintenance and repair of boilers, engines, heating apparatus, electric lighting and power plant, and water-supply system; purchase and maintenance of teams; maintenance, repair, exchange, or operation of motor truck or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; material for boxing nautical instruments for transportation; paints, telegraph and telephone service, and incidental labor, \$12,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to consume time unduly and I do not want to be cautioned by the floor leader, because I have not taken a minute on this bill. I also want to be in unison with the spirit of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] in what he said about the efforts to reduce the expenditures. What I am about to say is no criticism of the committee. I ask the attention of the chairman of the committee. I think the effort to reduce expenditures is very creditable and that it merits the approval of the House. There is a situation, however, that is distressing everybody. I am sure that this committee have tried to cut at every place they can, because there are places where cuts have been made that many Members wish were not necessary, cuts of established institutions like the library. I think the committee in their effort to cut down to bedrock are justified even in that.

Now, here is the thing to which I call the attention of the membership of this Committee of the Whole. This bill is just about four times the size of the bill before the war. I want that fact to have its full significance. I read Prof. Seligman's observations upon the estimates of the Treasury Department for next year. Without including in those estimates any provision for the railways, without including in the estimates anything in the way of a soldier bonus which might come, but including the sinking fund of \$287,000,000, the estimates for next year are \$4,889,000,000. That is over four times what the estimates were prior to the war. If you take this bill and compare it with the appropriations for 1914 it carries nearly four times what that bill carried. Now, here is the problem which I wish to present to this committee. I do not know how we are going to cure it. Is it true that two years after the war is over we have accepted a scale of expenditure that is four times the scale of expenditure before the war? Is that to be permanent? If it is there is positively no hope of any reduction of taxation and we are going to continue the war basis of taxation after the war is over. I appreciate the efforts of this committee to cut. As I said before, they have cut in places where it hurt, and I have wondered whether it could not be avoided. But, gentlemen, this increase of expenditures is bewildering. Is it true that there is no possibility of getting anywhere near to the normal basis prior to the war, or are we in these appropriations lifting the normal standard of cost level to a place where it will be permanent and

not at all reduced? The committee will recognize that the lump-sum appropriation is the source of this danger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Will my friend yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. Sisson. The trouble that your committee is going to have is not in reducing the scale of wages. The trouble is going to be to prevent the scale of wages being raised, because the Reclassification Commission is going to ask for very radical increases in the general scale of wages paid to Government employees in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FESS. I was aware of that statement, and if we read the editorial comment upon the dealings of Congress with the departments we find that we are criticized for our so-called niggardly policy. That is the way they put it—the niggardly policy of the Government toward the Navy Department and toward the War Department.

Now, gentlemen, if it means that, if we are to set the cost of the Government according to this war scale, we know that that war scale will be permanent. If that is to be made permanent, the cost to the Government to run these Government institutions is going to be four times what it was before the war opened. It is not fair to this Congress to be criticized as adopting a niggardly policy to our service when we are trying to prevent saddling on the Government four times the burden of taxation we had prior to the war. That came to us in this way: The War Department and the Navy Department and various governmental departments were given lump sums without any limitation as to salaries, and they shoved the salaries up abnormally.

I will state to my friend from Mississippi—what he will recall—that out of the Congressional Library was taken an assistant and put into the War Department and given a salary one-half greater than the chief in the library under whom he was serving while he was in the library. That was the order of shoving up the cost to the Government, and now we are told that we must make that standard permanent. If it be so there is no hope for any reduction of taxation. While I commend the committee for its effort to cut, and it has done it splendidly, the fact still remains that here is four times the expenditure in this bill of the last bill preceding the war.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, your committee has not sanctioned any salary of that kind.

Mr. FESS. I am aware of that, but I wanted to call the attention of the committee, not because the committee does not know it, but the country demands, on the one hand, that we reduce taxes and, on the other hand, that we deal with the Government service more generously. It is simply contradictory.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in answer to the gentleman and for the benefit of the House that this committee in this bill has made a heroic effort to get back as near as possible to the amount carried in this bill before the war.

This bill in 1916, before we got into the war, carried \$36,910,799. This bill carries \$103,650,016, or an increase as compared with 1916 of \$66,739,000.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there are three items in this bill that make up \$52,000,000 of this extra amount that we did not have anything to do with before we got into the war, that have been imposed upon us by reason and in consequence of the war. It carries \$36,000,000 more for the Internal Revenue Bureau than was carried before the war, made necessary by recent legislation passed by this Congress the enforcement of which is placed upon the Internal Revenue Department. For the War Risk Bureau we carry an item of \$11,000,000 that was not carried before, because there was no such bureau before the war. For the Census Bureau we carry in this bill \$5,000,000 that was not carried for a period of 10 years before this time, making a total of \$52,000,000. The difference between the amount of the prewar bill and this is \$14,000,000. We have decreased this bill as compared with the war bill passed for this same service \$23,000,000. We have decreased the estimates submitted by the various departments to your committee \$18,000,000. If all the committees will be as active in trying to get back to the normal basis when providing for these activities which came to us as necessities of the war and in consequence of the war, they will get back some time to something near our prewar normal.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will yield, there were \$10,000,000 carried in the current appropriation for the census.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. Fifteen million dollars.

Mr. Sisson. And \$5,000,000 this year; so that, as the gentleman from Indiana states, we have got this bill down within \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000 of what it was before the war, notwithstanding the fact of the enormous activities growing out of the war which we have not got rid of. I want to call my friend's attention to the fact that the bill did not carry the bonus of \$240.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. That is not a definite appropriation.

Mr. Mann of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana refers to the legislative bill for 1916 as the last bill before the war. It should have been the fiscal year of 1917, because that was the last legislative law passed before the war, and it was \$2,000,000 more than the act of 1916.

Mr. Wood of Indiana. I wanted to be conservative. I ask unanimous consent to insert this table as a part of my remarks, because it is very illuminating, showing where the increases are.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to insert the table referred to in his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Recapitulation showing appropriations for 1916 and amounts recommended for 1921.

Object.	Appropriation for 1916.	Amount recommended in bill for 1921.	Increase (+) or decrease (—) 1921 over 1916.
Senate.....	\$1,812,832.50	\$2,095,592.50	+ \$282,760.00
Capitol Police.....	57,350.00	65,750.00	+ 8,400.00
Joint Committee on Printing.....	7,600.00	7,600.00	—
House of Representatives.....	4,951,652.25	5,768,845.25	+ 817,193.00
Library of Congress.....	662,105.00	709,305.00	+ 47,200.00
Botanic Garden.....	31,300.00	72,487.00	+ 41,187.00
Executive Office.....	185,440.00	197,880.00	+ 12,440.00
Bureau of Efficiency.....	\$30,000.00	\$125,000.00	+ 95,000.00
Civil Service Commission.....	367,235.00	547,475.00	+ 180,240.00
State Department.....	383,500.00	1,027,660.00	+ 644,160.00
Treasury Department.....	4,672,872.00	20,296,251.36	+15,623,379.36
Internal Revenue.....	6,292,000.00	42,038,000.00	+35,746,000.00
Independent Treasury.....	479,820.00	231,870.00	— 247,950.00
Mints and assay offices.....	1,080,000.00	1,695,000.00	+ 615,000.00
War Department.....	1,838,008.00	4,934,420.00	+ 3,096,412.00
Public buildings and grounds.....	87,590.00	136,880.00	+ 49,290.00
State, War, and Navy Department buildings.....	156,840.00	1,965,680.00	+ 1,808,840.00
Navy Department.....	864,770.00	2,628,530.00	+ 1,763,760.00
Interior Department.....	4,871,830.00	5,120,870.00	+ 249,040.00
Surveyors general.....	220,450.00	175,000.00	— 45,450.00
Government in the Territories.....	125,500.00	\$204,360.00	+ 78,860.00
Post Office Department.....	1,804,275.00	2,035,720.00	+ 231,445.00
Department of Justice.....	608,590.00	639,020.00	+ 30,430.00
Department of Commerce.....	3,347,080.00	5,377,600.00	+ 2,030,520.00
Department of Labor.....	732,960.00	1,018,030.00	+ 285,070.00
Judicial.....	1,239,080.00	1,537,190.00	+ 298,110.00
Total.....	36,910,799.75	103,650,016.11	+66,739,216.36

¹ Division in Civil Service Commission.

² Includes \$10,834,400 for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and \$294,320 for the Federal Farm Loan Board, neither appropriated for for the fiscal year 1916.

³ Includes \$47,010 for legislative expenses for Alaska and \$30,000 legislative expenses for Hawaii, for which no provision was made in the fiscal year 1916.

⁴ Includes \$5,000,000 for the Fourteenth Decennial Census.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Wood of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The estimate for next year is for \$122,240,000; and the committee has cut that how much?

Mr. Wood of Indiana. We have reduced that to \$103,000,000—a cut of \$18,000,000.

Mr. FESS. I want to state that no criticism is made of the committee. It is simply the scale on which we are going and how the country has been criticizing the Congress for other things.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Observatory: Astronomers—1 \$3,600, 1 \$2,800; assistant astronomers—1 \$2,700, 1 \$2,400, 1 \$2,000, 1 \$1,800; assistants in department of nautical instruments—1 \$2,500, 1 \$1,600; clerks—1 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 2 of class 1; instrument maker, \$1,500; electrician, \$1,500; librarian, \$1,800; assistants—3 at \$1,600 each, 3 at \$1,400 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$900; foreman and captain of the watch, \$1,000; carpenter, \$1,000; engineer, \$1,200; 4 firemen; 7 watchmen; mechanic, \$900; 8 laborers; in all, \$60,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the point of order on parts of the paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know how the gentleman can reserve the point of order when one has been made.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order against parts of the paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this creates three new positions for which there appears to be no authorization. We granted a new position last year, and there is nothing on the face of the paragraph to indicate that it is a reduction in expenditures, although it does omit a couple of positions provided for last year.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to state the point of order that I wish to make.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], the chairman of the subcommittee, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order not to the paragraph but against the following items: The position of one astronomer at \$3,600 a year, it being a new position, unauthorized by law, the one at \$2,700 a year, it being a new position, likewise unauthorized by law, and the one at \$2,500, being an assistant in the department of nautical instruments, it being a new position and not authorized by law.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I make those three points of order because they are new positions created in this bill and unauthorized by law, and the committee had no right to put them in.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House and of the gentleman to what the situation will be if the point of order is insisted upon and sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. There are three parties waiting who expect to get these soft berths.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That is just the trouble. I wish it were possible to keep them in there. We would like to have done that, but this is the situation. Because of a law passed, as I understand, by the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy, he has abolished the corps of professors there, and these positions now and for some time have been filled by these retired officers the gentleman is talking about. Under the law these gentlemen can no longer fill those positions, and unless we supply them, by reason of the provision for civilian employees, this department will be absolutely crippled beyond all measure.

Mr. BLANTON. It has gotten along without them in the past.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; it has not. The two men who are now occupying these positions are these retired officers that the gentleman has talked about, put on the active list. They go finally upon the retired list, we are informed, at the close of this year, and then these two positions will be vacant.

Mr. BLANTON. I insist upon the point of order. They are new positions, are unauthorized by law, are unnecessary, and we should save this money.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will understand when doing that he is leaving the Naval Observatory in this attitude. Under the old law we sometimes had four of these naval officers whom they could use for that purpose, and I believe they have always had three who were competent to look after this business. If the gentleman will go out to the Naval Observatory and see the vast amount of work they do there in aid of navigation, in the way of adjusting compasses and timepieces on our ships, he will realize what sort of work they do there, and I do not think the gentleman would want to cripple that observatory.

I call attention also to this fact, that these naval officers cost a great deal more money because the salaries are very much higher than the salaries fixed here.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. Sisson. I was arguing the question to see if I could not induce the gentleman from Texas to withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana contend that this is authorized by law?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not contend it is authorized by law, but I wished to inform the House of the situation we will be in.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist on the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I insist on the point of order, because I do not believe it is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no other recourse but to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nautical Almanac Office: For assistants in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac—1 \$2,500, 1 \$2,000, 2 at \$1,800 each, 2 at \$1,600 each, 2 at \$1,400 each, 3 at \$1,200 each; assistant messenger; in all, \$18,420.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order—

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order against the position of assistant in preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanacs, one at \$2,500, for the reason that this is a new position unauthorized by law. I reserve the point of order for a minute, as I want to get some information. I call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to this fact. I want to know whether or not his committee had this information before it. In publishing this American Ephemeris three-fourths of the information that goes into that document comes from abroad and has come from abroad since the Paris agreement of 1911. Only one-fourth of the total of that document is furnished by this American department, and notwithstanding that fact each year during the last two years this bill has been increasing the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will say to the gentleman this is what the committee did. We dropped two places out at \$1,000 each because of the fact it requires men of more than ordinary ability to do this work. We created one position at \$2,500. That is the situation.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention right here to this fact: The gentleman is probably aware of the fact, if his committee went into the matter, that during the last year, with four positions vacant, this magazine was gotten out on time. There was not any stoppage in the work at all and the work was well performed. Why should the committee come in now and create this new \$2,500 position?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will tell the gentleman why. During the time the gentleman was speaking about with reference to the vacancies we had a number of reservists who were employed there, and they had a great deal larger force than they have now or can have under this appropriation, and I wish to say with reference to the importance of this work that—

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman speaking of the research work now?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I am speaking of the almanac. Every almanac that is gotten out by the State of Texas and every other State is founded upon this Nautical Almanac gotten out by the United States department. It is a very important work and should not be crippled, and it may be we have crippled it now a little, because of the fact we did not give them anywhere near the number of extra employees that they wanted. They did have a great amount of extra force during the war, because of the fact they had assigned several from the reservists corps which are now denied them.

Mr. BLANTON. But in the next paragraph you are allowing \$3,000 for piecework.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They have always had that.

Mr. BLANTON. Always had the sum of \$3,000?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why, they began with only \$1,000.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. That was a long while ago.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is aware of this fact, is he not, that not for 20 years has there been any research work published?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, I am not up on all the research work that has been done in the last 20 years.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, there has not been any published in 20 years.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman may be particularly informed about that. We do know they are cooperating, and of necessity there should be cooperation, for all the information this Nautical Almanac contains, between this Government and all civilized Governments.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman know for whom this position is fitted out especially?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I presume it is fitted out for the purposes for which this place is created. We have to have a Nautical Almanac.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not know the particular individual for whom this position is created?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this new position of \$2,500, because I do know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The services of draftsmen and such other technical services as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary may be employed only in the Bureau of Steam Engineering and at rates of compensation not exceeding those paid hereunder prior to January 1, 1918, to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Increase of the Navy" and "Engineering," to be paid from the appropriation "Engineering." Provided, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1921 shall not exceed \$184,000. A statement of the persons employed hereunder, their duties, and the compensation paid to each shall be made to Congress each year in the annual estimates.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals for the items.

Mr. WASON. He has that authority now.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman was going to rise after this paragraph.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Let us run until we get down to the Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a call of the House and a new shift. There have been about 25 or 30 or 40 of us working here all the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not tell from what the gentleman says what his request is.

Mr. WALSH. Will not the gentleman permit the committee to complete the naval item? He will recall that another matter interrupted the progress on this bill to-day. There is quite a good-sized attendance. Perhaps we might run as far as the Interior Department to-night.

Mr. BLANTON. I can stay here as long as the gentleman from Massachusetts can.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman might withdraw it for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriations made for the naval service shall be expended for any of the purposes (including freight and expressage) herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, except for personal services in certain bureaus, as herein expressly authorized.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12610, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'CONNELL, continued, on account of serious illness of his wife.

To Mr. McDUFFIE (at the request of Mr. OLIVER), indefinitely, on account of sickness in family and official business.

To Mr. LUHRING, for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BELL, for three days, on account of illness.

To Mr. GALLIVAN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. WELTY, for to-day, on account of illness.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Richmond, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9065) to amend sections 3, 8, 10, 12, 20, and 21 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm-loan act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 12351) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12351. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.; and

H. R. 6863. An act to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE TO VICE PRESIDENT AND MRS. MARSHALL.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I suppose most of the membership of the House have learned of the death of the son of Vice President and Mrs. Marshall. Death is so common that we note it but little, save it comes close to us in our own home. The death of a child appeals to all of us, and this great sorrow having come upon them, I thought it perfectly proper to present some resolution expressing the feeling of this House upon this occasion. I therefore have prepared and offer the following resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolutions expressing sympathy with the Vice President and Mrs. Marshall on the death of their son.

Resolved by the House of Representatives. That its membership learn with deep sorrow of the death of the adopted son of the Vice President and Mrs. Marshall.

Resolved. That we express to them our deep sympathy in this hour of grief and assure them that their ministration and love has awakened in the American people renewed admiration for the beauty of their home life.

Resolved. That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Speaker to Vice President and Mrs. Marshall.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolutions? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, February 27, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, transmitting report of all gifts and donations offered and accepted unconditionally by the Federal Board for Vocational Education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12711) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 678), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 680), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. MCKINIRY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of Perry L. Haynes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 681), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12772) to give preference right of employment on construction work on United States reclamation projects and preference right of entry on the public lands within such projects to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12773) to regulate the practice of osteopathy in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 12774) for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12776) to establish the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 12777) to further amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 472) asking the Military Affairs Committee of the House to investigate and report to the House whether our lack of preparedness in the late war was on account of inefficient soldiers or inefficient citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE: Resolution (H. Res. 473) authorizing the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, urging the United States Government to acknowledge the independence of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 12778) for the relief of the Dittlinger Lime Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 12779) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, determine, and adjudicate the claims of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 12780) to correct the military record of Eugene Downing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 12781) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Brandon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12782) granting a pension to Emanuel F. Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 12783) granting a pension to Anthony D. Mitten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12784) granting an increase of pension to Luther Van Arman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 12785) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12786) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to Spencer F. Griffin, of Catahoula Parish, La., certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1883. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the education commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church South and the Board of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, urging Congress to take action for the relief of the people of Europe and Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1884. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the International Iron Molders' Union, of Mansfield, Ohio, against the Sterling-Graham sedition bill, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1885. Also, petition of Eugene Laughlin, of Warsaw, Ohio, and 112 other citizens of Coshocton County, Ohio, favoring the so-called shoddy bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1886. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Rev. B. C. Witmore and members of his church, of Hanover, Pa.,

urging the passage of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1887. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of William Madison Hicks, chairman, and C. H. James, secretary, and numerous other citizens of West Frankfort, Ill., urging favorable consideration of House bill 1112, providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Rockford, Peru, Earlville, Mendota, and Garden Prairie, Ill., opposing the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1889. Also, petition of Capt. Frank H. Billig, of Rockford, Ill., relative to the bonus for the soldiers of the late war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1890. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of citizens of Dorchester and Boston, Mass., relative to the bonus for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1891. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Frank Hollander and Rosie Hollander, Jake Sheriff and Minnie Sheriff, Arthur Hall and Sam Hall, M. Wasser, Joe Goldfinger, Tillie Hecht, Julius Myer, Mrs. Myer, Abe Meyer, Isadore Myer, and Mrs. I. Myer, all of New York City, protesting against the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1892. By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of the City Council of the city of Portland, Oreg., relative to the protection of the timber from fire, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1893. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., relative to certain legislation regarding roads built to the national forests, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

1894. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Victor B. Bridgman Post, No. 44, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 5766; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1895. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of certain sections of House bill 12610; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1896. Also, petition of J. H. Williams & Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the restoration of the commercial attachés service eliminated by the House Appropriation Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1897. By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of the New York County United States Spanish War Veterans, protesting against the postal rate from 2 cents to 1 cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1898. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the board of county commissioners of Gooding County, Gooding, Idaho, and the Twentieth Century Club, of Twin Falls, Idaho, relative to Federal appropriations for the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

1899. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the Sagebrush Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Brush, Colo., relative to legislation regarding the bonus to the soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1900. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the cities of Akron and Flagler, of the State of Colorado, protesting against universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1901. Also, petition of citizens of the counties of Lincoln, Elbert, Kit Carson, and Cheyenne, of the State of Colorado, protesting against the Kahn military bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1902. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of Fairview Village, Montgomery County, Pa., in favor of the Sterling-Lehlbach bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1903. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of William G. Carroll Post, American Legion, Minnet, N. Dak., urging the passage of House bill 11553, providing for the soldiers' settlement in Imperial Valley, Calif., and means to irrigate such lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 27, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost know the secrets of all hearts. We can not dissemble from Thee and cloak our sins. We pray that the sanctifying influence of Thy Spirit may cleanse our hearts of everything that is evil in Thy sight, that we may present our lives spotless and blameless before Thee. Grant this day that the service we may render shall be all the service possible through us to our fellow men. May we be guided by Thy Holy Spirit, that our work begun, continued, and ended in Thee may be acceptable in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.